OFFICIUM
REVELLIORUM
IOCORUM·MASCARUM·QZ

Jackson Library –UNCG
PN2589.C4 c.1 v.1 NGUR
Chambers / The Elizabethan stage.
3 0510 0373123S

The Woman's College of
The University of North Carolina
LIBRARY

PN
2589
C4
v.1
c.2

For Building Use Only


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/elizabethanstage0001ekch_o6p5

THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

VOL. I

Oxford University Press
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the University

Wedding Mask of Sir Henry Unton
National Portrait Gallery

THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

BY E. K. CHAMBERS. VOL. I

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
M.CMXXIII

PN
2589
C4
V.1
C.2

Printed in England

To N. C.

PREFACE

In 1903 I explained the origin of *The Mediaeval Stage* out of preliminary investigations for a little book on Shakespeare. That little book is still unwritten, and perhaps it was only a mirage, since working days have their term, and all that I can now offer, after an interval of twenty years, is another instalment of *prolegomena*. It has been in hand, more or less, throughout that period, which now ends felicitously with the tercentenary of the First Folio. But it has often been laid aside for other literary diversions, and still more often through the preoccupations of a life mainly concerned with activities remote from letters. As a result, I have constantly had to take account of new material furnished by the research or the speculations of others; and I only hope that in the process of revision I have succeeded in achieving a reasonable completeness of statement and a reasonable consistency in the conclusions of chapters drafted at very different dates.

Much in these volumes is of course mere archaeology, but the historian may find some interest in the development of the stage as an institution, and in the social and economic conditions which made such a development possible. My First Book is devoted to a description, perhaps disproportionate, of the Elizabethan Court, and of the ramifications in pageant and progress, tilt and mask, of that instinct for spectacular *mimesis*, which the Renaissance inherited from the Middle Ages, and of which the drama is itself the most important manifestation. The Second Book gives an account of the settlement of the players in London, of their conflict, backed by the Court, with the tendencies of Puritanism, and of the place which they ultimately found in the monarchical polity. To the Third and Fourth belong the more pedestrian

84271

task of following in detail the fortunes of the individual playing companies and the individual theatres, with such fullness as the available records permit. The Fifth deals with the surviving plays, not in their literary aspect, which lies outside my plan, but as documents helping to throw light upon the history of the institution which produced them. I have not for the most part carried my investigations beyond the death of Shakespeare, and although I have sometimes regretted that I did not push on to the closing of the theatres, the decision not to do so has long been irretrievable.

Obviously I am treading a region far more carefully charted by predecessors than that of *The Mediaeval Stage*; but the progress of Elizabethan scholarship during recent years has been so great as to render a fresh attempt at a synthesis justifiable. I am conscious of a deeper debt than I can express to many fellow-workers, notably to my friends Dr. W. W. Greg and Mr. A. W. Pollard and Professor Feuillerat of Rennes, and to a growing band of American students, of whom I may name Professor C. W. Wallace and Mr. J. T. Murray as examples.

E. K. C.

January, 1923.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

PAGE

PREFACE vii
LIST OF AUTHORITIES xv

BOOK I. THE COURT

I. ELIZABETH AND JAMES 1
II. THE ROYAL HOUSEHOLD 27
III. THE REVELS OFFICE 71
IV. PAGEANTRY 106
V. THE MASK 149
VI. THE MASK (*continued*) 175
VII. THE COURT PLAY 213

BOOK II. THE CONTROL OF THE STAGE

VIII. HUMANISM AND PURITANISM 236
IX. THE STRUGGLE OF COURT AND CITY 269
X. THE ACTOR'S QUALITY 308
XI. THE ACTOR'S ECONOMICS 348

VOLUME II

BOOK III. THE COMPANIES

XII. INTRODUCTION. THE BOY COMPANIES . . 1
A. Introduction 3
B. The Boy Companies—
i. Children of Paul's 8
ii. Children of the Chapel and Queen's Revels . 23
iii. Children of Windsor 61
iv. Children of the King's Revels . . . 64
v. Children of Bristol 68
vi. Westminster School 69
vii. Eton College 73

The Boy Companies (*cont.*)— PAGE
viii. Merchant Taylors School 75
ix. The Earl of Leicester's Boys . . . 76
x. The Earl of Oxford's Boys . . . 76
xi. Mr. Stanley's Boys 76

XIII. The Adult Companies 77
i. The Court Interluders 77
ii. The Earl of Leicester's Men . . . 85
iii. Lord Rich's Men 91
iv. Lord Abergavenny's Men 92
v. The Earl of Sussex's Men 92
vi. Sir Robert Lane's Men 96
vii. The Earl of Lincoln's (Lord Clinton's) Men . 96
viii. The Earl of Warwick's Men . . . 97
ix. The Earl of Oxford's Men 99
x. The Earl of Essex's Men 102
xi. Lord Vaux's Men 103
xii. Lord Berkeley's Men 103
xiii. Queen Elizabeth's Men 104
xiv. The Earl of Arundel's Men . . . 116
xv. The Earl of Hertford's Men . . . 116
xvi. Mr. Evelyn's Men 117
xvii. The Earl of Derby's (Lord Strange's) Men . 118
xviii. The Earl of Pembroke's Men . . . 128
xix. The Lord Admiral's (Lord Howard's, Earl of Nottingham's), Prince Henry's, and Elector Palatine's Men 134
xx. The Lord Chamberlain's (Lord Hunsdon's) and King's Men 192
xxi. The Earl of Worcester's and Queen Anne's Men 220
xxii. The Duke of Lennox's Men . . . 241
xxiii. The Duke of York's (Prince Charles's) Men . 241
xxiv. The Lady Elizabeth's Men . . . 246

XIV. International Companies 261
i. Italian Players in England . . . 261
ii. English Players in Scotland . . . 265
iii. English Players on the Continent . . 270

XV. Actors 295

BOOK IV. THE PLAY-HOUSES

PAGE

XVI. Introduction. The Public Theatres . . 353
A. Introduction 355
B. The Public Theatres—
i. The Red Lion Inn 379
ii. The Bull Inn 380
iii. The Bell Inn 381
iv. The Bel Savage Inn 382
v. The Cross Keys Inn 383
vi. The Theatre 383
vii. The Curtain 400
viii. Newington Butts 404
ix. The Rose 405
x. The Swan 411
xi. The Globe 414
xii. The Fortune 435
xiii. The Boar's Head 443
xiv. The Red Bull 445
xv. The Hope 448
xvi. Porter's Hall 472
XVII. The Private Theatres 475
i. The Blackfriars 475
ii. The Whitefriars 515
XVIII. The Structure and Conduct of Theatres . 518

VOLUME III

XIX. Staging at Court 1
XX. Staging in the Theatres: Sixteenth Century 47
XXI. Staging in the Theatres: Seventeenth Century 103

BOOK V. PLAYS AND PLAYWRIGHTS

XXII. The Printing of Plays 157
XXIII. Playwrights 201

VOLUME IV

PAGE

XXIV. Anonymous Work 1
A. Plays 1
B. Masks 55
C. Receptions and Entertainments . . 60

APPENDICES

A. A Court Calendar 75
B. Court Payments 131
C. Documents of Criticism 184
D. Documents of Control 259
E. Plague Records 345
F. The Presence-Chamber at Greenwich . . . 351
G. Serlio's *Trattato sopra le Scene* 353
H. *The Gull's Hornbook* 365
I. Restoration Testimony 369
K. Academic Plays 373
L. Printed Plays 379
M. Lost Plays 398
N. Manuscript Plays 404

INDEXES

I. Plays 409
II. Persons 425
III. Places 445
IV. Subjects 454

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Wedding Mask of Sir Henry Unton. From picture in National Portrait Gallery . Vol. i, *frontispiece*

Domus Capitularis S^tt^ Pauli a Meridie Prospectus. By Wenceslaus Hollar. From Sir William Dugdale, *History of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1658) . . . . . Vol. ii, *frontispiece*

Diagrams of the Blackfriars Theatres . Vol. ii, p. 504

Interior of the Swan Theatre. From the drawing after Johannes de Witt in Arend van Buchell's commonplace-book . . Vol. ii, p. 521

Coliseus sive Theatrum. From edition of Terence published by Lazarus Soardus (Venice, 1497 and 1499) . . . Vol. iii, *frontispiece*

Diagrams of Stages . . . . . Vol. iii, pp. 84, 85

Design for Cockpit Theatre at Whitehall. By Inigo Jones. From Library of Worcester College, Oxford . . . . Vol. iv, *frontispiece*

The *Profilo* or Section of a Stage. From Sebastiano Serlio, *Architettura* (1551) . Vol. iv, p. 354

The *Pianta* or Ground-Plan of a Stage (*ibid.*) Vol. iv, p. 357

Elevation of a *Scena Comica* (*ibid.*) . . Vol. iv, p. 359

Elevation of a *Scena Tragica* (*ibid.*) . . Vol. iv, p. 361

Elevation of a *Scena Satyrica* (*ibid.*) . . Vol. iv, p. 362

NOTE ON SYMBOLS

I HAVE found it convenient, especially in Appendix A, to use the symbol <, following a date, to indicate an uncertain date not earlier than that named, and the symbol >, followed by a date, to indicate an uncertain date not later than that named. Thus 1903 <> 23 would indicate the composition date of any part of this book. I have sometimes placed the date of a play in italics, where it was desirable to indicate the date of production rather than publication.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

[*General Bibliographical Note.* The few books here named are mainly those whose range is sufficiently wide to cover the greater part of my own ground. Others, more limited in their scope, are reserved for mention in the preliminary notes to the chapters upon whose subject-matter they directly bear; and in particular the bibliography of the drama, as distinct from the stage, receives full treatment in Book V. The scanty Restoration notices of the pre-Restoration stage are to be found in R. Flecknoe, *A Short Discourse of the English Stage* (1664), the anonymous *Historia Histrionica* (1699) ascribed to James Wright, and J. Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708). W. R. Chetwood's *General History of the Stage* (1749) is of no value, and its honesty is suspect. The first scholar to attempt a systematic history was E. Malone, in his *Account of our Ancient Theatres* (1790) and *Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage* (1790), of which a revised version, with much fresh matter, was included by J. Boswell in the *Third Variorum Shakespeare* (1821). Something was added by G. Chalmers in the *Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage* which forms part of his *Apology for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers* (1797), and in an enlarged shape of his *Supplemental Apology* (1799). The first edition of J. P. Collier's *History of English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage* appeared in 1831. Thereafter Collier made many further contributions to the subject, in the publications of the *Shakespeare Society*, and in his *New Facts regarding the Life of Shakespeare* (1835), *New Particulars regarding the Works of Shakespeare* (1836), and *Farther Particulars regarding Shakespeare and his Works* (1839). These abound in forgeries, of which some are analysed in C. M. Ingleby, *A Complete View of the Shakspere Controversy* (1861), and which have not all been excluded from the current edition of the *History* (1879). Some new ground was broken by F. G. Fleay, who gave real stimulus to investigation by the series of hasty generalizations and unstable hypotheses contained in his *On the Actor Lists, 1578–1642* (*R. H. Soc. Trans.* ix. 44), *On the History of Theatres in London, 1576–1642* (*R. H. Soc. Trans.* x. 114), *Shakespeare Manual* (1876, 1878), *Introduction to Shakespearian Study* (1877), *Life and Work of Shakespeare* (1886), *Chronicle History of the London Stage* (1890), and *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*

(1891). Little is added to or corrected in Fleay by H. Maas, *Äussere Geschichte der englischen Theatertruppen* (1907). Some useful documents were brought together by W. C. Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes* (1869). An interesting account from the French point of view is given of the earlier part of the period by J. J. Jusserand, *Le Théâtre en Angleterre depuis la Conquête jusqu'aux prédécesseurs immédiats de Shakespeare* (1878, 1881). R. A. Small, *The Stage-quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters* (1899), and G. P. Baker, *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist* (1907), are also valuable studies. Light is thrown upon stage-history by other specialist books about Shakespeare, particularly J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare* (1881, 1890), and S. Lee, *Life of William Shakespeare* (1898, 1915, 1922). In recent years fresh material has been brought together by various researchers, notably by J. T. Murray in *English Dramatic Companies* (1910) and by C. W. Wallace in *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars* (1908), *The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare* (1912), and in a number of papers in the *Nebraska University Studies* and elsewhere. The Dulwich documents originally published by J. P. Collier in *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn* (1841), *Alleyn Papers* (1843), and *Henslowe's Diary* (1845) have been more scientifically edited by W. W. Greg in *Henslowe's Diary* (1904–8) and *Henslowe Papers* (1907), and the *Extracts from Accounts of Revels at Court* (1842) by P. Cunningham have been superseded and supplemented by A. Feuillerat, *Documents relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth* (1908) and *Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary* (1914). The work of gathering together miscellaneous documents and studies passed from *The Shakespeare Society's Papers* (1844–9) to the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society* (1874–92), and is now carried on by the *Collections* (1907–13) of the *Malone Society*. A summary of both the older and the recent learning will be found in A. H. Thorndike, *Shakespeare's Theater* (1916), and a full account of the theatres in J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses* (1917). Little importance need be attached to H. B. Baker, *The London Stage* (1889, 1904), or to C. Hastings, *The Theatre: its Development in France and England* (1901), or to R. F. Sharp, *A Short History of the English Stage* (1909), or to M. Jonas, *Shakespeare and the Stage* (1918). But J. Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage* (1832), is still valuable on the Restoration period, of which a modern account is given in R. W. Lowe, *Thomas Betterton* (1891), while W. J. Lawrence, *The*

Elizabethan Playhouse (1912, 1913), and A. Thaler, *Shakspere to Sheridan* (1922), help to trace the connexion with Elizabethan days. —The chief histories of the Elizabethan drama are A. W. Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne* (1875, 1899), J. A. Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama* (1884, 1900), F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (1908), C. F. T. Brooke, *The Tudor Drama* (1912). A special aspect is dealt with in F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914), and a daughter period in G. H. Nettleton, *English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (1914). The drama of modern Europe generally is treated in J. Klein, *Geschichte des Dramas* (1865–75), and R. Prölss, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1881–3), both of which are now of less value than the comprehensive *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1893–1916) of W. Creizenach, from which part of the English section has been translated as *The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (1916). Treatises on contemporary foreign stages are A. d'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro italiano* (1891), E. Rigal, *Le Théâtre français avant la période classique* (1901), and H. A. Rennert, *The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega* (1909).—Of general histories of English literature the most important are Hazlitt–Warton, *History of English Poetry, from the Twelfth to the close of the Sixteenth Century* (1871), H. A. Taine, *History of English Literature* (1890), H. Morley, *English Writers* (1887–95), J. J. Jusserand, *Histoire littéraire du peuple anglais* (1894–1904), G. Körting, *Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Litteratur* (1910, mainly of bibliographical value), W. J. Courthope, *History of English Poetry* (1895–1910), and *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (1907–16), of which vols. v and vi are wholly devoted to the pre-Restoration drama. The social conditions of the period may be best studied in *Shakespeare's England* (1916). The most valuable bibliographical data are in W. W. Greg, *A List of English Plays* (1900) and *A List of Masques, Pageants, &c.* (1902), and in the *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, edited by E. Arber (1875–94), for 1554–1640, and by G. E. B. Eyre (1913–14) for 1640–1708. The *Dictionary of National Biography* is a standard work of reference. Of the periodicals in which dissertations on the stage and drama have been published, the most important are, in England, *The Modern Language Quarterly* (1896–1902) and its successor *The Modern Language Review* (1905–22), *Notes and Queries* (1850–1922), and *The Library* (1889–1922); in America, *Modern Philology* (1903–22), *Modern Language Notes* (1886–1922), *The Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (1886–1922), *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (1897–

1921), and *Studies in Philology* (1915–22); and in Germany, the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (1865–1921), *Englische Studien* (1877–1922), *Anglia* (1878–1922), and *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* (1848–1922).

The following list of books is mainly intended to elucidate the references in the foot-notes, and has no claim to bibliographical completeness or accuracy.]

Abstract. Truth Brought to Light and Discovered by Time. 1651. [With Abstract of revenue and expenditure for 1617.]

Adams. A Dictionary of the Drama. By W. D. Adams. Vol. i, A–G, 1904 [all issued].

Adams. Shakespearean Playhouses. By J. Q. Adams. 1917.

Aikin, *Eliz.* Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth. By L. Aikin. 2 vols., 1818.

Aikin, *James.* Memoirs of the Court of James I. By L. Aikin. 2 vols., 1822.

Albrecht. Das englische Kindertheater. Von A. Albrecht. 1883. [Halle dissertation.]

Albright. The Shakespearian Stage. By V. E. Albright. 1909.

Ancona. Origini del Teatro italiano. Per A. d'Ancona. 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1891.

Anglia. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Vols. i–xlvi. 1878–1922. Beiblatt zu *Anglia.* Mitteilungen über englische Sprache und Literatur. Vols. i–xxxiii. 1891–1922.

Ankenbrand. Die Figur des Geistes im Drama der englischen Renaissance. Von H. Ankenbrand. 1906.

Anson. The Law and Custom of the Constitution. By W. R. Anson. 4th ed., 2 vols., 1909, 1911.

Arber. Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers, 1554–1640. Edited by E. Arber. 5 vols., 1875–94.

Archiv. Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen. Vols. i–cxliii., 1848–1922. [Known as *Herrig's Archiv.* In progress.]

Ashmole. The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Garter. By E. Ashmole. 1672.

Aubrey. 'Brief Lives', Chiefly of Contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey. Edited by A. Clark. 2 vols., 1898.

Aydelotte. Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds. By Frank Aydelotte. 1913. [*Oxford Historical and Literary Studies.*]

Baker. The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist. By G. P. Baker. 1907.

Baker. The London Stage: Its History, 1576–1888. By H. B. Baker. 2 vols., 1889; 2nd ed. 1 vol., 1904.

Baldwin. The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages. By J. F. Baldwin. 1913.

Ballweg. Das klassizistische Drama zur Zeit Shakespeares. Von O. Ballweg. 1910.

Bapst. Essai sur l'Histoire du Théâtre. Par E. Bapst. 1893.

Bates–Godfrey. English Drama. A Working Basis. By K. L. Bates and L. B. Godfrey. 1896. [*Wellesley College.*]

Batiffol. The Century of the Renaissance. By L. Batiffol. Translated by E. F. Buckley. 1916.

Bayfield. A Study of Shakespeare's Versification. By M. A. Bayfield. 1920.

Beard. The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in its Origin and Development. By C. A. Beard. 1904. [*Columbia Univ. Studies.*]

Beaumont. L'Ambassade de France en Angleterre sous Henri IV. Mission de Christophe de Harley, Comte de Beaumont (1602–5). Par P. P. Laffleur de Kermaingant. 2 vols., 1895.

Beesly. Queen Elizabeth. By E. S. Beesly. 1892.

Berkeley MSS. Catalogue of the Muniments at Berkeley Castle. By I. H. Jeayes. 1892.

Besant. London in the Time of the Stuarts. By W. Besant. 1903.

Besant. London in the Time of the Tudors. By W. Besant. 1904.

Besant. London South of the Thames. By W. Besant. 1912.

Bibliographica. Bibliographica. 3 vols., 1895–7.

Bibl. Soc. The Bibliographical Society.

Bibl. Trans. Transactions of the Bibliographical Society. 15 vols., 1893–1919. Index to vols. i–x, 1910; to vols. xi–xv, 1919. [Amalgamated from 1920 with *The Library* (q.v.).]

Biog. Dram. Biographia Dramatica: Memoirs of Dramatic Writers and Actors. To 1764 by D. E. Baker, continued to 1782 by I. Reed, and to 1811 by S. Jones. 3 vols. in 4, 1812.

Birch, *Eliz.* Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the Year 1581 till her Death. By T. Birch. 2 vols., 1754.

Birch, *Henry.* The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I. By T. Birch. 1760.

Birch, *James.* The Court and Times of James the First. Edited [from collections of T. Birch] by the Author of 'Memoirs of Sophia Dorothea'. 2 vols., 1848.

B. L. The Belles-Lettres Series.

Boas. Shakspere and his Predecessors. By F. S. Boas. 1896.

Boas. University Drama in the Tudor Age. By F. S. Boas. 1914.

Bohun. A Full Account of the Character of Queen Elizabeth. By E. Bohun. 1693.

Boissise. L'Ambassade de France en Angleterre sous Henri IV. Mission de Jean de Thumery, Sieur de Boissise (1596–1602). Par P. P. Laffleur de Kermaingant. 2 vols., 1886.

Bolte. Die Singspiele der englischen Komödianten und ihrer Nachfolger in Deutschland, Holland, und Scandinavien. Von J. Bolte. 1893.

Bond, *Lyly.* The Complete Works of John Lyly. Edited by R. W. Bond. 3 vols., 1902.

Bradley. Shakespearean Tragedy. By A. C. Bradley. 1904.

Bradley. Life of the Lady Arabella Stuart. By E. T. Bradley. 2 vols., 1889.

Braines. Holywell Priory and the Site of the Theatre, Shoreditch. By W. W. Braines. 1915.

Braines. The Site of the Globe Playhouse. By W. W. Braines. 1921.

Brandl. Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare. Von A. Brandl. 1898.

Brewer. Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Arranged and catalogued by J. S. Brewer [and afterwards J. Gairdner and R. H. Brodie]. 21 vols., 1862–1910. [*Calendars of State Papers.*]

Brodmeier. Die Shakespeare-Bühne nach den alten Bühnen-Anweisungen. Von C. Brodmeier. 1904.

Brooke. The Shakespeare Apocrypha. Edited by C. F. T. Brooke. 1908.

Brooke. The Tudor Drama ; a History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare. By C. F. T. Brooke. 1912.

Brotanek. Die englischen Maskenspiele. Von R. Brotanek. 1902.

Bruce. Letters of Elizabeth and James VI. By J. Bruce. 1849. [*C. S.* xlvi.]

Bullen, *O. E. P.* A Collection of Old English Plays. Edited by A. H. Bullen. 4 vols., 1882–5.

Burgon. Life and Times of Sir T. Gresham. By J. W. Burgon. 2 vols., 1839.

Burn. The High Commission. By J. S. Burn. 1865.

Burn. The Star Chamber. By J. S. Burn. 1870.

Cabala. Cabala, sive Scrinia Sacra : Mysteries of State and Government in Letters of Illustrious Persons and Great Ministers of State. 1654. 3rd ed., 2 Parts, 1691.

Camden. G. Camdeni Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha. 1615–25. Edidit T. Hearnius. 3 vols., 1717. Transl. 3rd ed. 1635.

Camden, *James.* Gulielmi Camdeni Annales ab Anno 1603 ad Annum 1623 [appended to *Camdeni et Illustrium Virorum Epistolae,* 1691].

Capell. Notitia Dramatica ; or, Tables of Ancient Playes (from their Beginning to the Restoration of Charles the Second) so many as have been printed, with their Several Editions : faithfully compiled and digested in quite new method, by E[dward] C[apell] [1783]. [Part of *The School of Shakespeare.*]

Carlisle. An Inquiry into the Place and Quality of the Gentlemen of his Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Chamber. By N. Carlisle. 1829.

Carey. Memoirs of Robert Cary Earl of Monmouth. Edited by G. H. Powell. 1905.

Castelain. Ben Jonson : l'homme et l'œuvre. Par M. Castelain. 1907.

C. D. I. Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España. Por M. Fernandez de Navarrete. 112 vols., 1842–95.

Cecil. Life of Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury. By A. Cecil. 1915.

C. H. The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. 14 vols., 1907–16.

Chalmers. An Apology for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers.

[By G. Chalmers.] 1797. [Includes an *Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage*, reprinted in *Variorum* iii. 410.]

CHALMERS, *S. A.* A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers. [By G. Chalmers.] 1799. [Contains an enlarged *Account of the English Stage*.]

CHAMBERLAIN. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by S. Williams. 1861. [*C. S.* lxxix.]

CHAMBERLAYNE. Angliae Notitiae, or The Present State of England. By J. Chamberlayne. 1669, &c.

CHAMBERLIN. The Private Character of Queen Elizabeth. By F. Chamberlin. 1921.

CHAMBERS. Cyclopaedia of English Literature. New edition by D. Patrick. 3 vols., 1901–3. W. and R. Chambers.

CHAMBERS. A Fifteenth-Century Courtesy Book. Edited by R. W. Chambers. 1914. [*E. E. T. S.* o. s. cxlviii.]

CHAMBERS. The Mediaeval Stage. By E. K. Chambers. 2 vols., 1903.

CHAMBERS. Notes on the History of the Revels Office under the Tudors. By E. K. Chambers. 1906.

CHAPMAN. Ancient Royal Palaces in and near London. Drawn in Lithography by T. R. Way. With Notes compiled by F. Chapman. 1902.

CHARVET. Sébastien Serlio. Par L. Charvet. 1897.

CHASE. The English Heroic Play. By L. N. Chase. 1903.

Chaucer Records. Life Records of Chaucer. By F. J. Furnivall and R. E. G. Kirk. 4 Parts, 1875–1900. [*Chaucer Soc.* ii. 12, 14, 21, 32.]

CHETWOOD. The British Theatre. Containing the Lives of the English Dramatic Poets; with an Account of all their Plays. By W. R. Chetwood. 1750, 1752.

CHETWOOD. A General History of the Stage, from its Origin in Greece down to the Present Time, with Memoirs of the Principal Performers. By W. R. Chetwood. 1749.

CHEYNEY. A History of England, from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth. By E. P. Cheyney. Vol. i, 1914. [In progress.]

CHURCHILL. Richard the Third up to Shakespeare. By G. B. Churchill. 1900.

CLAPHAM–GODFREY. Some Famous Buildings and their Story. By A. W. Clapham and W. H. Godfrey. [1913.]

CLEPHAN. The Tournament. Its Periods and Phases. By R. C. Clephan. 1919.

CLODE. The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors. By C. M. Clode. 2 vols., 1888.

CLODE. Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors. By C. M. Clode. 1875.

COHN. Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By A. Cohn. 1865.

COKAYNE. Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom. By G. E. C[okayne]. 8 vols., 1887–98; 2nd ed. by V. Gibbs, 1910–21. [In progress.]

COLLIER. The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of

Shakespeare: and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration. By J. P. Collier. 3 vols., 1831; new ed. [cited], 3 vols., 1879.

COLLIER, *M. A.* Memoirs of Edward Alleyn. By J. P. Collier. 1841. [*Shakespeare Society.*]

COLLIER, *A. P.* Alleyn Papers: Original Documents illustrative of the Life of Edward Alleyn, and of the Early Stage. By J. P. Collier. 1843. [*Shakespeare Society.*]

COLLIER, *N. F.* New Facts regarding the Life of Shakespeare. By J. P. Collier. 1835.

COLLIER, *N. P.* New Particulars regarding the Works of Shakespeare. By J. P. Collier. 1836.

COLLIER, *F. P.* Farther Particulars regarding Shakespeare and his Works. By J. P. Collier. 1839.

COLLIER, *Illustr.* Illustrations of Old English Literature. By J. P. Collier. 3 vols., 1866.

Columbia Sh. Studies. Shaksperian Studies by the Members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University. Edited by B. Matthews and A. H. Thorndike. 1916.

COURTHOPE. A History of English Poetry. By W. J. Courthope. 6 vols., 1895–1910.

COWLING. Music on the Shakespearian Stage. By G. H. Cowling. 1913.

CRAWFORD. Collectanea. By C. Crawford. 2 Series, 1906–7.

CRAWFORD, *E. P.* England's Parnassus. Compiled by R[obert] A[llot]. 1600. Edited by C. Crawford. 1913.

CREIGHTON. A History of Epidemics in Britain. By C. Creighton. 2 vols., 1891–4.

CREIGHTON. Queen Elizabeth. By M. Creighton. 1896, 1899, &c.

CREIZENACH. Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten. Von W. Creizenach. 1889.

CREIZENACH. Geschichte des neueren Dramas. Von W. Creizenach. Vols. i, 1893 (2nd ed. 1911); ii, 1901; iii, 1903; iv, 1909; v, 1916. [Cited by vol. and page.]

CREIZENACH. The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare. Translated from Band iv of *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* of W. Creizenach. 1916. [Cited by page.]

CRIPPS-DAY. The History of the Tournament in England and in France. By F. H. Cripps-Day. 1918.

C. S. Camden Society, now incorporated with Royal Historical Society.

CUNLIFFE. The Influence of Seneca in Elizabethan Tragedy. An Essay by J. W. Cunliffe. 1893. [Manchester dissertation.]

CUNNINGHAM. Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court, in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James. By P. Cunningham. 1842. [*Shakespeare Society.*]

CUSHMAN. The Devil and the Vice in the English Dramatic Literature before Shakespeare. By L. W. Cushman. 1900.

DASENT. Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series, by J. R. Dasent. 32 vols., 1890–1907.

DAVIES. The Baronial Opposition to Edward II. By J. C. Davies. 1918.

DAVIS. Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum. By H. W. C. Davis. Vol. i, 1913.

DAVISON. The Life of William Davison. By N. H. Nicolas. 1823.

DEE. The Private Diary of John Dee. By J. O. Halliwell. 1842. [*C. S.* xix.]

DEKKER. The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker. Edited by A. B. Grosart. 5 vols., 1884–6. [*Huth Library.*]

DEKKER, *G. H. B.* The Gull's Hornbook. By T. Dekker. Edited by R. B. McKerrow. 1904. [*King's Library.*]

DEVEREUX. Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, 1540–1646. By W. B. Devereux. 2 vols., 1853.

DICEY. A. V. Dicey. The Privy Council. 1887.

DIGGES. The Compleat Ambassador. By Sir D. Digges. 1655.

DITCHFIELD. The England of Shakespeare. By P. H. Ditchfield. 1917.

D. N. B. Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by L. Stephen and S. Lee. Re-issue, with Supplement, 22 vols., 1908–9. Second Supplement, Index, and Epitome, 1913.

DODSLEY. A Select Collection of Old Plays. 12 vols., 1744. Published by Robert Dodsley (*Dodsley*[1]). Second Edition by I. Reed. 12 vols., 1780 (*Dodsley*[2]). New Edition [by J. P. Collier]. 12 vols., 1825–7 (*Dodsley*[3]). Fourth Edition by W. C. Hazlitt. 15 vols., 1874–6 (*Dodsley*[4]).

DONNE. The Life and Letters of John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's. By E. Gosse. 2 vols., 1899.

DOWNES. Roscius Anglicanus, or, an Historical Review of the Stage, 1660–1706. By J. Downes. 1708; repr. ed. J. Knight, 1886.

DRAKE. Shakspeare and his Times. By N. Drake. 2 vols., 1817; 2nd ed., 1 vol., 1838.

Dramatic Records. A Collection of Ancient Documents respecting the Office of Master of the Revels. By J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps. 1870.

DUFF. A Century of the English Book Trade, 1457–1557. By E. G. Duff. 1905. [*Bibl. Soc.*]

ECKHARDT. Die Dialekt- und Ausländertypen des älteren englischen Dramas. Von E. Eckhardt. 1910–11. [*Materialien* xxvii, xxxii.]

ECKHARDT. Die lustige Person im älteren englischen Drama (bis 1642). Von E. Eckhardt. 1902. [*Palaestra* xvii.]

EDWARDS. The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh, together with his Letters. By E. Edwards. 2 vols., 1868.

E. E. C. T. Early English Classical Tragedies. Edited by J. W. Cunliffe. 1912.

Eg. P. The Egerton Papers. A Collection of Public and Private Documents. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1840. [*C. S.* xii.]

E. H. R. The English Historical Review. Vols. i–xxxvii, 1886–1922. [In progress.] Index to vols. i–xx, 1906; to vols. xxi–xxx, 1916.

EINSTEIN. The Italian Renaissance in England. By L. Einstein. 1902.

ELLIS. Original Letters Illustrative of English History. Edited by H. Ellis. 1st Series, 3 vols., 1824, 2nd ed. 1825; 2nd Series, 4 vols., 1827; 3rd Series, 4 vols., 1846.

ELSON. Shakespeare in Music. By L. C. Elson. 1908.

E. P. I. Early Plays from the Italian. Edited by R. W. Bond. 1911.

E. S. Englische Studien: Organ für englische Philologie. Vols. i–lvi, 1877–1922. [In progress.] General-register to vols. 1–25, 1902.

Essays and Studies. Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. 8 vols., 1910–22.

Evans. English Masques. By H. A. Evans. 1897.

Eyre. A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640–1708. Edited by G. E. B. Eyre. 3 vols., 1913–14. [*Roxburghe Club.*]

Fairholt. The Civic Garland. By F. W. Fairholt. 1845. [*Percy Soc.* lxi.]

Fairholt. Lord Mayors' Pageants. By F. W. Fairholt. 2 vols., 1843–4. [*Percy Soc.* xxxviii, xliii.]

Fanshawe. The Practice of Exchequer Court, With its severall Offices and Officers. By Sir T. Fanshawe. 1658.

Farmer. See *S. F. T.*, *T. F. T.*

Fellowes. English Madrigal Verse. By E. H. Fellowes. 1920.

Ferrari. La Scenografia. Per G. Ferrari. 1902.

Feuillerat, *Eliz.* Documents relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by A. Feuillerat. 1908. [*Materialien* xxi.]

Feuillerat, *E. and M.* Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary. Edited by A. Feuillerat. 1914. [*Materialien* xliv.]

Feuillerat, *M. P.* Le Bureau des Menus-Plaisirs et la Mise en Scène à la Cour d'Élizabeth. Par A. Feuillerat. 1910.

ffoulkes. Armour and Weapons. By C. ffoulkes. 1909.

Finch MSS. Report on the Manuscripts of A. G. Finch, Esq. Vol. i, 1913. [*Hist. MSS.*]

Finett. Finetti Philoxenis: Some Choice Observations of Sir John Finett, Knight, and Master of the Ceremonies, . . . Touching . . . Foreign Ambassadors in England. 1656.

Fischer. Zur Kunstentwickelung der englischen Tragödie bis zu Shakespeare. Von R. Fischer. 1893.

Fleay, *B. C.* A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559–1642. By F. G. Fleay. 2 vols., 1891. [Generally cited by author's name, vol., and page only.]

Fleay, *C. H.* A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559–1642. By F. G. Fleay. 1890. [Generally cited by author's name and page only.]

Fleay, *Manual.* Shakespeare Manual. By F. G. Fleay. 1876, new ed. 1878.

Fleay, *Shakespeare.* A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare. By F. G. Fleay. 1886.

Fleay. On the History of Theatres in London, 1576–1642. By F. G. Fleay. n. d. [Extract from *R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* x (1882) 114.]

Fleay. Queen Elizabeth, Croydon, and the Drama. By F. G. Fleay. [1898.]

Flechsig. Die Dekorationen der modernen Bühne in Italien. Von E. Flechsig. 1894.

Flecknoe. A Short Discourse of the English Stage. Appended to

Love's Kingdom. By R. Flecknoe. 1664. [Reprinted in HAZLITT, *E. D. S.*]

Fleta. Fleta, seu Commentarius Juris Anglicani. Edidit J. Selden. 1685.

FORTESCUE. Sir John Fortescue's Governance of England. Edited by C. Plummer. 1885.

FOURNEL. Les Contemporains de Molière. Par V. Fournel. 2 vols., 1863.

FOWELL–PALMER. Censorship in England. By F. Fowell and F. Palmer. 1913.

FREEBURG. Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama. By V. O. Freeburg. 1915. [*Columbia Univ. Studies.*]

FROUDE. A History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Armada. By J. A. Froude. 12 vols., 1856–70; new ed., 12 vols., 1881, &c.

FURNIVALL. The Babees Book: Manners and Meals in the Olden Time. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. 1868. [*E. E. T. S.* o. s. xxxii.]

FURNIVALL. Queen Elizabethes Achademy, &c. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. 1869. [*E. E. T. S.* e. s. viii.]

GAEDERTZ. Zur Kenntnis der altenglischen Bühne. Von K. T. Gaedertz. 1888.

GARDINER. History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War. By S. R. Gardiner. 1863–84, &c.

GARDNER. Dukes and Poets at Ferrara; Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. By E. Gardner. 1904.

GARDNER. The King of Court Poets; a Study of the Work, Life, and Times of Ludovico Ariosto. 1906.

GAWDY. Letters of Philip Gawdy, 1579–1616. Edited by I. H. Jeayes. 1906. [*Roxburghe Club.*]

GAYLEY, *R. E. C.* Representative English Comedies. Edited by G. M. Gayley. 3 vols., 1903–14.

GEE. The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558–64. By H. Gee. 1898.

GENEST. Some Account of the English Stage, 1660–1830. [By J. Genest.] 10 vols., 1832.

GILDERSLEEVE. Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama. By V. C. Gildersleeve. 1908. [*Columbia Univ. Studies in English.*]

GILDON. The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets. [By Charles Gildon.] N. D. [1698], 1699.

G. M. G[ODDEN]. The Stage Censor. An Historical Sketch: 1544–1907. By G. M. G. 1908.

GOEDEKE. Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung aus den Quellen. Von K. Goedeke. 2te Auflage. 9 vols., 1884–1910.

GONZALEZ. Apuntamientos para la historia del rey Felipe II, sus relaciones con la reina Isabel de Inglaterra, 1558–76. Por T. Gonzalez. 1832. [*Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia*, vii.] *See* HALL.

GOODMAN. The Court of King James the First. By G. Goodman: to which are added Letters illustrative of Characters in the Court. Edited by J. S. Brewer. 2 vols., 1839.

Gosse. The Jacobean Poets. By E. Gosse. 1894, 1899.

Gosse. Seventeenth-Century Studies. By E. Gosse. 1883, 1897.

Gosse. A Short History of Modern English Literature. By E. Gosse. 1897; new ed. 1905.

Gosson, *P. C.* Playes Confuted in Five Actions. By S. Gosson. 1582. [*See* Hazlitt, *E. D. S.*]

Gosson, *S. A.* The Schoole of Abuse. By S. Gosson. 1579. Edited by E. Arber. 1868. [*English Reprints.*]

Graf. Der Miles Gloriosus im englischen Drama bis zur Zeit des Bürgerkrieges. Von H. Graf. 1891. [Rostock diss.]

Graves. The Court and the London Theatres during the Reign of Elizabeth. By T. S. Graves. 1913.

Green. A Short History of the English People. By J. R. Green. 1874, &c.; revised ed. 1888, &c.; illustrated ed., 4 vols., 1893–4, &c.

Green. A History of the English People. By J. R. Green. 4 vols., 1877–80; 'Eversley' ed., 8 vols., 1895–6.

Green. Elizabeth Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia. By M. A. E. Green. Revised by S. C. Lomas. 1909.

Greene. The Life and Complete Works of Robert Greene. Edited by A. B. Grosart. 15 vols., 1881–6. [*Huth Library.*]

Greg, *Pastoral.* Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama: A Literary Inquiry, with special Reference to the pre-Restoration Stage in England. By W. W. Greg. 1906.

Greg, *Plays.* A List of English Plays written before 1643 and printed before 1700. By W. W. Greg. 1900. [*Bibliographical Society.*]

Greg, *Masques.* A List of Masques, Pageants, &c., Supplementary to a List of English Plays. By W. W. Greg. 1902. [*Bibliographical Society.*]

Grierson. The First Half of the Seventeenth Century. By H. J. C. Grierson. 1906. [*Periods of European Literature.*]

Griffiths. Evenings with Shakespeare; with Suggestions for the Study of other Elizabethan Literature. By L. M. Griffiths. 1889.

Gross. A Bibliography of British Municipal History. By C. Gross. 1897. [*Harvard Hist. Studies.*]

Hall. Society in the Elizabethan Age. By H. Hall. 1886, 1887.

Hall. The Red Book of the Exchequer. Edited by H. Hall. 3 vols., 1896. [*Rolls Series.*]

Hall. Studies in English Official Historical Documents. By H. Hall. 1908.

Hall. A Formula Book of English Official Historical Documents. Edited by H. Hall. 2 Parts. 1908, 1909.

Hall. Documents from Simancas, relating to the Reign of Elizabeth, 1558–68. Translated from T. Gonzalez by S. Hall. 1865. *See* Gonzalez.

Halliwell-Phillipps. Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. By J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps. 9th ed., 2 vols.

Halliwell-Phillipps, *Dict.* A Dictionary of Old English Plays in Print or Manuscript, including Latin Plays by English Authors. By J. O. Halliwell[-Phillipps]. 1860.

Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations.* Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare. By J. O. Halliwell[-Phillipps]. Part I. 1874.

HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS, *W. W.* The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom: to which are added Illustrations of Shakespeare and the Early English Drama. Edited by J. O. Halliwell[-Phillipps]. 1846. [*Sh. Soc.*]

HANNAY. The Later Renaissance. By D. Hannay. 1898. [*Periods of European Literature.*]

HARBEN. A Dictionary of London. By H. A. Harben. 1918.

HARCOURT. His Grace the Steward and the Trial of Peers. By L. W. Vernon Harcourt. 1907.

Hardwicke Papers. Miscellaneous State Papers, 1501–1726. [Edited by P. Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke.] 2 vols., 1778.

HARDY. Arbella Stuart. By B. C. Hardy. 1913.

HARDY. Syllabus, in English, of Rymer's Foedera. By Sir T. D. Hardy. 3 vols., 1869–85. [*Calendars of State Papers.*]

HARINGTON. Nugae Antiquae: being a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Papers. By Sir John Harington and Others. Selected by Henry Harington. 1769, 1775; 2nd ed., 3 vols., 1779; 3rd ed., by T. Park. 2 vols., 1804.

HARRISON. Harrison's Description of England in Shakespeare's Youth: the 2nd and 3rd books of his Description of Britaine. By W. Harrison. 1577. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. 4 Parts, 1877–1908. [*N. S. S.* and *Shakespeare Library.*]

HARVEY. The Works of Gabriel Harvey. Edited by A. B. Grosart. 3 vols., 1884–5. [*Huth Library.*]

HASTINGS. The Theatre: its Development in France and England. By C. Hastings. Translated by F. A. Welby. 1901.

Hatfield MSS. Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Parts i–xiii, 1883–1915. [*Hist. MSS.* The collection is also known as the *Cecil Papers.*]

HATTON. Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton, including his Correspondence. By N. H. Nicolas. 1847.

HAWARDE. Les Reportes del Cases in Camera Stellata, 1593–1609. From the original Manuscript of John Hawarde. Edited by W. P. Baildon. 1894.

HAYNES-MURDIN. A Collection of State Papers, from Letters and Memorials left by William Cecil, Lord Burghley. Vol. i, by S. Haynes, 1740; vol. ii, by W. Murdin, 1759.

HAZLITT. The Collected Works of William Hazlitt. Edited by A. R. Waller and A. Glover. 13 vols., 1902–6. [Vol. i has *Characters of Shakespear's Plays*, 1817, and vol. v *Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth*, 1820.]

HAZLITT, *E. D. S.* The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes, 1543–1664, illustrated by a series of Documents, Treatises, and Poems. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 1869. [*Roxburghe Library.*]

HAZLITT, *Jest-Books.* Shakespeare Jest-Books. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 3 vols., 1864. Second edition (*C. Mery Talys* and *Merry Tales and Quick Answers* only), 1 vol., 1881.

HAZLITT, *Manual.* A Manual for the Collector and Amateur of Old English Plays. By W. C. Hazlitt. 1892.

HAZLITT, *S. L.* Shakespeare's Library. Second Edition by W. C. Hazlitt. 6 vols., 1875.

HAZLITT–WARTON. History of English Poetry, from the Twelfth to the close of the Sixteenth Century. By T. Warton. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 4 vols., 1871.

HEARNE. Liber Niger Scaccarii. Edited by T. Hearne. 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1774.

HENDERSON. James I and VI. By T. F. Henderson. 1904.

HENNESSY. Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense. By G. Hennessy. 1898.

HENSLOWE. Henslowe's Diary, 1591–1609. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1845. [*Shakespeare Society.*]

HENSLOWE. Henslowe's Diary. Edited by W. W. Greg. 2 vols., 1904–8. [Cited.]

Henslowe Papers. Henslowe Papers: being Documents supplementary to Henslowe's Diary. Edited by W. W. Greg. 1907.

HENTZNER. Pauli Hentzneri J. C. Itinerarium Germaniae, Galliae, Angliae, Italiae. 1612, 1629.

HERBERT. The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert. Edited by J. Q. Adams. 1917. [*Cornell Studies in English*, iii.]

HERBERT. Typographical Antiquities: or an Historical Account of Printing in Great Britain and Ireland. Begun by J. Ames. Augmented by W. Herbert. 3 vols., 1785–90.

HERFORD. A Sketch of the History of the English Drama in its Social Aspects. By C. H. Herford. 1881.

HERFORD. The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century. By C. H. Herford. 1886.

HERRMANN. Forschungen zur deutschen Theatergeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance. Von M. Herrmann. 1914.

HERZ. Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland. Von E. Herz. 1903. [*Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen*, xviii.]

HEWITT. Ancient Armour and Weapons in Europe. By J. Hewitt. 3 vols., 1855–60.

HEYWOOD. An Apology for Actors. By Thomas Heywood. 1612. Reprint, 1841. [*Shakespeare Society.*]

HINDLEY. The Old Book Collector's Miscellany. By C. Hindley. 3 vols., 1871–3.

Hist. Hist. Historia Histrionica. An Historical Account of the English Stage; showing the Ancient Uses, Improvement, and Perfection of Dramatic Representations, in this Nation. In a Dialogue of Plays and Players. [By James Wright.] 1699; facs. repr. by Ashbee, 1872. [Text in Dodsley[4], xv. 399, and Lang, *Social England*, 421 (*English Garner*).]

Hist. MSS. Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1870–1916. [In progress. The earlier Reports on individual collections were mostly issued as Appendices to General Reports; those since about 1899 as separate publications.]

H. O. A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household. 1790. [*Soc. of Antiquaries.*]

HOLINSHED. Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland. By R. Holinshed. 1577, 1587; reprint, 6 vols., 1807–8.

HOPKINSON. Essays on Shakespeare's Doubtful Plays. By A. F. Hopkinson. 13 parts, 1900.

HORNEMANN. Das Privy Council von England zur Zeit der Königin Elisabeth. Von C. Hornemann. 1912.

HOWARD. A Collection of Letters. Edited by L. Howard. 1753; 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1756.

HULBERT. Chaucer's Official Life. By J. R. Hulbert. 1912.

HUME. The Great Lord Burghley. By M. A. S. Hume. 1908.

INGEGNERI. Della Poesia rappresentativa e del modo di rappresentare le Favole sceniche. Per A. Ingegneri. 1598.

INGLEBY. A complete View of the Shakspere Controversy concerning the Genuineness of the Manuscript Matter published by Collier. By C. M. Ingleby. 1861.

INGLEBY, *Allusion-Books*. Shakspere Allusion-Books. Part I. Edited by C. M. Ingleby. 1874. [*N. S. S.*]

INNES. England under the Tudors. By A. D. Innes. [1905.]

JAGGARD. Shakespeare Bibliography: A Dictionary of every known issue of the writings of our national poet and of recorded opinion thereon in the English Language. By W. Jaggard. 1911.

Jahrbuch. Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. Vols. i–lvii, 1865–1921. [In progress.]

JEAFFRESON. Middlesex County Records. Edited by J. C. Jeaffreson. 4 vols., 1888–92. [*Middlesex County Records Society*.]

J. G. P. The Journal of Germanic Philology [afterwards The Journal of English and Germanic Philology]. Vols. i–xx, 1897–1921. [In progress.]

JONAS. Shakespeare and the Stage. By M. Jonas. 1918.

JONES. Inigo Jones, a Life; and Five Court Masques. By P. Cunningham and J. P. Collier. 1848. [*Sh. Soc.*]

JUPP. Historical Account of the Company of Carpenters. By E. B. Jupp. 1848. 2nd ed. by W. W. Pocock. 1887.

JUSSERAND. Histoire littéraire du peuple anglais. Par J. J. Jusserand. Des origines à la Renaissance. 1894. De la Renaissance à la Guerre Civile. 1904. Translated as Literary History of the English People. 3 vols., 1895–1909.

JUSSERAND, *Th*. Le Théâtre en Angleterre depuis la Conquête jusqu'aux prédécesseurs immédiats de Shakespeare. Par J. J. Jusserand. 1878; 2nd ed., 1881.

KAULFUSS-DIESCH. Die Inszenierung des deutschen Dramas an der Wende des sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. Von C. H. Kaulfuss-Diesch. 1905.

KELLY. Royal Progresses and Visits to Leicester. By W. Kelly. 1884.

KEMPE. Manuscripts preserved in the Muniment Room at Loseley House. By A. J. Kempe. 1835.

KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE. Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre sous le règne de Philippe II. Par le Baron J. M. B. C. Kervyn de Lettenhove. 11 vols., 1882–1900. [*Commission Royale d'Histoire de Belgique*.]

KLEIN. Geschichte des Dramas. Von J. Klein. 13 vols., 1865–75. Register-Band von T. Ebner, 1886. [Vols. xii, xiii contain 'Das englische Drama'.]

KOEPPEL. Ben Jonson's Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker, und andere Studien zur inneren Geschichte des englischen Dramas. Von E. Koeppel. 1906. [*Anglistische Forschungen*, xx.]

KOEPPEL. Studien über Shakespeare's Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker. Von E. Koeppel. 1905. [*Materialien*, ix.]

KOEPPEL. Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in der englischen Litteratur des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Von E. Koeppel. 1892. [*Q. F.* lxx.]

KOEPPEL. Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's und John Ford's. Von E. Koeppel. 1897. [*Q. F.* lxxxii.]

KOEPPEL. Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, John Marston's, und Beaumont's und Fletcher's. Von E. Koeppel. 1895. [*Münchener Beiträge*, xi.]

KÖRTING. Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Litteratur von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Von G. Körting. 5th ed., 1910.

LA BODERIE. Ambassades de Monsieur [A. Le Fèvre] de La Boderie en Angleterre, 1606–11. 5 vols., 1750.

LACROIX. Ballets et Mascarades de Cour de Henri III à Louis XIV. Par P. Lacroix. 6 vols., 1868–70.

LAFONTAINE. The King's Musick. By H. C. De Lafontaine. 1909.

LAMB. Specimens of English Dramatic Poets who Lived about the Time of Shakespeare. By Charles Lamb. 1808. Edition by I. Gollancz. 2 vols., 1893.

LA MOTHE. Correspondance diplomatique de Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon. Edited by C. P. Cooper. 7 vols., 1838–75.

LANCASTER. Le Mémoire de Mahelot, Laurent, et d'autres décorateurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. By H. C. Lancaster. 1920.

LANG. History of English Literature from 'Beowulf' to Swinburne. By A. Lang. 1912.

LANGBAINE. Momus Triumphans: or, the Plagiaries of the English Stage; Expos'd in a Catalogue of all the Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, Masques, Tragedies, Opera's, Pastorals, Interludes, &c., both Ancient and Modern, that were ever yet Printed in English. By Gerard Langbaine. 1688.

LANGBAINE. An Account of the English Dramatick Poets. Or, Some Observations and Remarks on the Lives and Writings, of all those that have Publish'd either Comedies, Tragedies, Tragi-Comedies, Pastorals, Masques, Interludes, Farces, or Opera's in the English Tongue. By Gerard Langbaine. 1691.

Lang. et Litt. Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature françaises, des origines à 1900. Publiée sous la direction de L. Petit de Julleville. 8 vols., 1896–1900.

LARSON. The King's Household in England before the Norman Conquest. By L. M. Larson. 1904.

LAW. Shakespeare as a Groom of the Chamber. By E. Law. 1910.

LAW. Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries. By E. Law. 1911.

LAW. More about Shakespeare ' Forgeries '. By E. Law. 1913.

LAWRENCE. The Elizabethan Playhouse and other Studies. By W. J. Lawrence. 1st and 2nd Series, 1912, 1913.

LEE. A Life of William Shakespeare. By S. Lee. 1898; new ed. 1915, 1922.

LEE. Shakespeare and the Modern Stage: with other Essays. By S. Lee. 1906.

LEE. The French Renaissance in England. By S. Lee. 1910.

LEONARD. Early History of English Poor Relief. By E. M. Leonard. 1900.

Library. The Library: a Quarterly Review of Bibliography and Library Lore. 1st Series, 10 vols., 1889–98; 2nd Series, 10 vols., 1900–9; 3rd Series, 10 vols., 1910–19; 4th Series, vols. i–iii, 1920–22. [In progress. See *Bibl. Trans.*]

LINTILHAC. Histoire générale du Théâtre en France. Par E. Lintilhac. 4 vols., 1904–9. [In progress.]

LODGE. Illustrations of British History, Biography, and Manners in the Reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I. By E. Lodge. 3 vols., 1791; 2nd [3rd] ed., 3 vols., 1838.

LOFTIE. History of London. By W. J. Loftie. 2 vols., 1883.

Loseley MSS. Report on the Manuscripts of W. M. Molyneux, Esq., at Loseley. 1879. [*Hist. MSS*. Appendix to 7th Report.]

LOWE, *Bibl*. A Bibliographical Account of English Theatrical Literature. By R. W. Lowe. 1888.

LOWE. Thomas Betterton. By R. W. Lowe. 1891.

LOWELL. The Old English Dramatists. By J. R. Lowell. 1892.

L. T. R. The London Topographical Record. 11 vols., 1901–17 (in progress). [*London Topographical Society*.]

LYSONS. The Environs of London. By D. Lysons. 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1811.

T. M. The Blacke Booke. 1604. [The Epistle is signed T. M. Reprint in Bullen's *Middleton*, viii.]

MAAS. Die Kindertruppen: ein Kapitel aus der Geschichte der englischen Theatergesellschaften, 1559–1642. Von H. Maas. 1901. [Göttingen dissertation.]

MAAS. Äussere Geschichte der englischen Theatertruppen in dem Zeitraum von 1559 bis 1642. Von H. Maas. 1907. [*Materialien*, xix.]

MACHYN. The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550–1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1848. [*C. S*. xlii.]

MADDEN. The Diary of Master William Silence: A Study of Shakespeare and of Elizabethan Sport. By D. H. Madden. 1897; 2nd ed. 1907.

MADOX. The History and Antiquities of the Exchequer. By T. Madox. 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1769.

MAHELOT. La Mise en scène à Paris au XVII^e siècle: Mémoire de L. Mahelot et M. Laurent. Par E. Dacier. 1901. [*Mémoires de la Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, xxviii.]

MALONE. Account of our Ancient Theatres. By E. Malone. 1790.

MALONE. Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English

Stage. 1790. [Also issued with Malone's *Shakespeare* (1790), i. 2, and enlarged in *Variorum* (1821), iii.]

MANLY. Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama. Edited by J. M. Manly. 2 vols., 1897. [In progress.]

MANNINGHAM. Diary of John Manningham, 1602–3. Edited by J. Bruce. 1868. [*C. S.* xcix.]

MANTZIUS. History of Theatrical Art in Ancient and Modern Times. By K. Mantzius. Translated by L. v. Cossel. 5 vols., 1903–9.

MARSAN. La Pastorale dramatique en France à la fin du XVI^e^ et au commencement du XVII^e^ siècle. Par J. Marsan. 1905.

MARSH. Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters. By B. Marsh. 4 vols., 1913–16.

MARTIN. The Site of the Globe Playhouse of Shakespeare. By W. Martin. 1910. [Extract from *Surrey Archaeological Collections*.]

Martin's. The Accounts of the Churchwardens of St. Martin's in the Fields. By J. V. Kitto. 1901.

Materialien. Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas. Begründet und herausgegeben von W. Bang. Louvain. 43 vols., 1902–14.

MATTHEW. The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew. By A. H. Mathew and A. Calthrop. 1907.

MATTHEWS. The Development of the Drama. By B. Matthews. 1904.

MCCONAUGHTY. The School Drama, including Palgrave's Introduction to Acolastus. By J. L. McConaughty. 1913.

MCKERROW. Notes on Bibliographical Evidence for Literary Students. By R. B. McKerrow. 1914. [Extract from *Bibl. Soc. Trans.* xii.]

MCKERROW, *Devices*. Printers' and Publishers' Devices, 1455–1640. By R. B. McKerrow. 1913. [*Bibl. Soc.*]

MCKERROW, *Dict*. A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers, 1557–1640. By R. B. McKerrow and others. 1910. [*Bibl. Soc.*]

Mediaeval Stage. See CHAMBERS.

MELVILLE. Memoirs of his own Life (1549–93). By Sir James Melville. Edited by T. Thomson. 1827. [*Bannatyne Club*.]

M. E. D. The Masterpieces of the English Drama Series.

MEISSNER. Die englischen Comoedianten zur Zeit Shakespeares in Oesterreich. Von J. Meissner. 1884.

MENTZEL. Geschichte der Schauspielkunst in Frankfurt am Main. Von E. Mentzel. 1882.

MERES. Palladis Tamia: Wit's Treasury. By Francis Meres. 1598. [*See* INGLEBY, *Allusion-Books*.]

Mermaid Series. The Best Plays of the Old Dramatists. 22 vols., 1887–95.

MEYER. Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama. By E. Meyer. 1897.

Middleton MSS. Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton at Wollaton Hall. 1911. [*Hist. MSS.*]

MINTO. Characteristics of English Poets, from Chaucer to Shirley. By W. Minto. 1874; 2nd ed., 1885.

MITTON. Maps of Old London. By G. E. Mitton. 1908.

M. L. A. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. Vols. i–xxxvii, 1886–1922. [In progress.]

M. L. N. Modern Language Notes. Vols. i–xxxvii, 1886–1922. [In progress.]

M. L. Q. The Modern Language Quarterly. 6 vols., 1896–1902.

M. L. R. The Modern Language Review. Vols. i–xvii, 1905–22. [In progress.]

MONKEMEYER. Prolegomena zu einer Darstellung der englischen Volksbühne. Von P. Monkemeyer. 1905.

MONTAGUE. History of England, 1603–60. By F. C. Montague. 1907.

MORLEY. English Writers. By H. Morley. New ed., 11 vols., 1887–95.

M. P. Modern Philology: a Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in Modern Languages and Literatures. Vols. i–xix, 1903–22. [In progress.]

M. S. C. Collections. Vol. i, 1907–11; vol. ii, pt. 1, 1913. [*Malone Society*. In progress.]

M. S. R. The Malone Society Reprints. 46 vols., 1907–21. [In progress.]

MUNDAY. A Second and Third Blast of Retrait from Plaies and Theaters. Set forth by Anglophile Eutheo [A. Munday ?]. 1580. [*See* HAZLITT, *E. D. S.*]

MURRAY. English Dramatic Companies, 1558–1642. By J. T. Murray. 2 vols., 1910.

Mus. Ant. The Musical Antiquary. 4 vols., 1909–13.

NAGEL. Annalen der englischen Hofmusik. Von W. Nagel. 1894.

NARES. Memoirs of the Life and Administration of the Right Honourable William Cecil, Lord Burghley. By E. Nares. 3 vols., 1828–31.

NASHE. The Works of Thomas Nashe. Edited by R. B. McKerrow. 5 vols. 1904–10.

NAUNTON. Fragmenta Regalia. Memoirs of Elizabeth, Her Court and Favourites. By Sir R. Naunton. 1641; 2nd ed. 1653; ed. E. Arber, 1870.

NAYLOR. Shakespeare and Music. By E. W. Naylor. 1896.

NEILSON, *C. E. D.* The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists, excluding Shakespeare. Edited by W. A. Neilson. 1911.

NERI. La Tragedia italiana del Cinquecento. Per F. Neri. 1904.

NETTLETON. English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century. By G. H. Nettleton. 1914.

NEUBNER. Missachtete Shakespeare-Dramen. Von A. Neubner. 1907.

NEUENDORFF. Die englische Volksbühne im Zeitalter Shakespeares nach den Bühnenanweisungen. Von B. Neuendorff. 1910.

NICHOLL. Some Account of the Company of Ironmongers. By J. Nicholl. 1851; 2nd ed. 1866.

NICHOLLS. History of the English Poor Law. By G. Nicholls. 2 vols., 1854; new ed. 1898.

NICHOLS, *Eliz.* The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth. By J. Nichols. 3 vols., 1788–1807; 2nd ed. [usually cited], 3 vols., 1823.

NICHOLS, *James.* The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First. By J. Nichols. 4 vols., 1828.

NICHOLS, *Illustr.* Illustrations of the Manners and Expences of Antient Times in England. [By J. Nichols.] 1797.

NICHOLS, *Pag.* London Pageants. [By J. G. Nichols.] 1837.

NICOLAS. Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, 1386–1542. By H. Nicolas. 7 vols., 1834–7.

NORDEN, *Essex*. Speculi Britanniae Pars. Description of Essex. By J. Norden. Edited by H. Ellis. 1840. [*O. S.* ix.]

NORDEN, *Herts*. Speculi Britanniae Pars. Description of Hertfordshire. By J. Norden. 1598. [Reprint with *Preparative*. 1723.]

NORDEN, *Middlesex*. Speculum Britanniae, the First Parte. Description of Middlesex. By J. Norden. 1593. [Reprint with *Preparative to Speculum Britanniae*. 1723.]

NORTHBROOKE. A Treatise wherein Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine Playes, or Enterludes, are Reproved. By J. Northbrooke. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1843. [*Shakespeare Society*.]

N. Q. Notes and Queries: a Medium of Intercommunication for Literary Men and General Readers. 12 Series, 1850–1922. [In progress.]

N. S. S. New Shakspere Society.

N. S. S. Trans. Transactions of the New Shakspere Society, 1874, 1875–6, 1877–9, 1880–6, 1887–92.

N. U. S. Nebraska University Studies. Vols. i–xiii, [1888]–1913.

OGILBY. Britannia: An Illustration of England and Wales by a Geographical and Historical Description of the Principal Roads thereof. By J. Ogilby. 1675, &c.

ORDISH. Early London Theatres. By T. F. Ordish. 1894.

ORDISH. Shakespeare's London. By T. F. Ordish. 1897; 2nd ed. 1904.

OTT. Die italienische Novelle im englischen Drama von 1600 bis zur Restauration. Von A. Ott. 1904.

OULTON. History of the Theatre. By C. W. Oulton. 1796; 2nd ed. 1817.

PARKER. Correspondence of Matthew Parker. Edited by J. Bruce and T. T. Perowne. 1853. [*Parker Soc.* xlix.]

P. C. See NICOLAS and DASENT.

P. C. Wales. A Calendar of the Register of the Queen's Majesty's Council in the Dominion and Principality of Wales and the Marches of the Same, 1569–91. By R. Flenley. 1916. [*Cymmrodorion Soc.*]

PECK. Desiderata Curiosa; or, A Collection of Divers Scarce and Curious Pieces relating chiefly to Matters of English History. By F. Peck. 2 vols., 1732, 1735; 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1779.

PEGGE. Curialia: or an Historical Account of the Royal Household. By S. Pegge. 2 vols., 1791–1806.

PEGGE. Curialia miscellanea. By S. Pegge. Edited by J. Nichols. 1818.

Pepys MSS. Report on the Pepys Manuscripts at Magdalene College, Cambridge. 1911. [*Hist. MSS*.]

PERCY. The Privy Council under the Tudors. By E. Percy. 1907.

PHILIP II. Correspondencia de Felipe II con sus embajadores en Inglaterra, 1558–84. 5 vols. [*Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, lxxxvii, lxxxix–xcii.]

PHILLIPS. Theatrum Poetarum, or a Compleat Collection of the Poets, especially the most Eminent of all Ages. By Edward Phillips. 1675.

PLOMER. A Short History of English Printing. By H. R. Plomer. 1900.

PLOMER, *Dict.* A Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers, 1641–67. By H. R. Plomer. 1907. [*Bibl. Soc.*]

PLUMMER. Elizabethan Oxford: Reprints of Rare Tracts. By C. Plummer. 1887. [*Oxford Hist. Soc.* viii.]

POEL. Shakespeare in the Theatre. By W. Poel. 1915.

POEL. Some Notes on Shakespeare's Stage and Plays. By W. Poel. 1916. [Extract from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.*]

POLLARD. History of England, 1547–1603. By A. F. Pollard. 1910.

POLLARD, *F. and Q.* Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: a Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays, 1594–1685. By A. W. Pollard. 1909.

POLLARD, *Sh. F.* Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text. By A. W. Pollard. 1917 (cited), 1920.

Procl. Bibliography of Royal Proclamations, 1485–1714; with Historical Essay by R. Steele. 2 vols., 1910–11. [*Bibliotheca Lindesiana*, v, vi.]

PRÖLSS. Geschichte des neueren Dramas. Von R. Prölss. 3 vols., 1881–3.

PRÖLSS. Von den ältesten Drucken der Dramen Shakespeares. Von R. Prölss. 1905.

PRUNIÈRES. Le Ballet de Cour en France avant Benserade et Lully. Par H. Prunières. 1914.

Q. F. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker. Herausgegeben von B. ten Brink, E. Martin, E. Schmidt. [Separate monographs.]

RAIT. Royal Palaces of England. Edited by R. S. Rait. 1911.

RASI. I Comici italiani; Biografia, Bibliografia, Iconografia. Per L. Rasi. 2 vols., 1897–1905.

R. d'H. L. Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France. Publiée par la Société d'Histoire Littéraire de la France. 29 vols., 1894–1922. [In progress.]

Remembrancia. Analytical Index to the Series of Records known as the Remembrancia, preserved among the Archives of the City of London, 1579–1664. 1878.

RENDLE. Old Southwark and its People. By W. Rendle. 1878.

RENDLE, *Bankside.* The Bankside, Southwark, and the Globe. By W. Rendle. 1877. [Part ii, App. i, of HARRISON (q.v.).]

RENDLE–NORMAN. The Inns of Old Southwark. By W. Rendle and P. Norman. 1888.

RENNERT. The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega. By H. A. Rennert. 1909.

REYHER. Les Masques anglais. Par P. Reyher. 1909.

REYNOLDS. Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging. By G. F. Reynolds. 1905. [Extract from *Modern Philology*, v.]

RHODES. The Stagery of Shakespeare. By R. C. Rhodes. 1922.

R. H. S. Trans. Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Four Series, 1873–1922. [In progress.]

RIBTON-TURNER. History of Vagrants and Vagrancy. By C. J. Ribton-Turner. 1887.

RICHARDSON. The Lover of Queen Elizabeth. Being the Life and

Character of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1533–88. By Mrs. Aubrey Richardson. [1907.]

RIGAL. Le Théâtre français avant la période classique. Par E. Rigal. 1901.

RIMBAULT. The Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal. By E. F. Rimbault. 1872. [*C. S.* n.s. iii.]

RISTINE. English Tragi-comedy: its Origin and History. By F. H. Ristine. 1910.

ROBERTSON. Did Shakespeare write *Titus Andronicus*? By J. M. Robertson. 1905.

ROBERTSON. Shakespeare and Chapman. By J. M. Robertson. 1917.

ROBERTSON. The Shakespeare Canon. By J. M. Robertson. 1922.

ROTHSCHILD. Shakespeare and his Day. A Study of the Topical Element in Shakespeare and in the Elizabethan Drama. By J. A. de Rothschild. 1906.

ROUND. The King's Serjeants and Officers of State. By J. H. Round. 1911.

Rutland MSS. The Manuscripts of the Duke of Rutland at Belvoir Castle. 4 vols., 1888–1905. [*Hist. MSS.* Vols. i–iii are appendices to the 12th and 14th Reports; vol. iv was issued separately.]

RYE. England as seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First. By W. B. Rye. 1865.

RYMER. Foedera, conventiones, litterae, et cujuscumque generis acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, pontifices, principes, vel communitates. By T. Rymer. 20 vols., 1704–35.

SABBATINI. Pratica di fabricar scene e macchine ne' teatri. Per N. Sabbatini. 1638.

SAINTSBURY. History of Elizabethan Literature. By G. Saintsbury. 1887, 1890.

SAINTSBURY. Short History of English Literature. By G. Saintsbury. 1900, 1903.

SAINTSBURY. A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe. By G. Saintsbury. 3 vols., 1900–4.

SAINTSBURY. The Earlier Renaissance. By G. Saintsbury. 1901. [*Periods of European Literature.*]

Sadler Papers. State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler. Edited by A. Clifford. 3 vols., 1809.

S. C. The Shakespeare Classics Series.

SCARGILL-BIRD. Guide to Various Classes of Documents in the Public Record Office. By S. R. Scargill-Bird. 3rd ed., 1908. [*Calendars of State Papers.*]

SCHELLING. The English Chronicle Play: a Study in the Popular Historical Literature Environing Shakespeare. By F. E. Schelling. 1902.

SCHELLING. Elizabethan Drama, 1558–1642. By F. E. Schelling. 2 vols., 1908.

SCHELLING. English Literature during the Lifetime of Shakespeare. By F. E. Schelling. 1910.

SCHELLING. English Drama. By F. E. Schelling. 1914. [*Channels of English Literature.*]

Schücking. Studien über die stofflichen Beziehungen der englischen Komödie zur italienischen bis Lilly. Von L. L. Schücking. 1901.

Schwab. Das Schauspiel im Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeare's. Von H. Schwab. 1896.

Scofield. The Court of Star Chamber. By C. Scofield. 1900. [Chicago dissertation.]

Scott. Elizabethan Translations from the Italian. By M. A. Scott. 1916.

Sc. P. Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547–1603, in the Public Record Office, British Museum, and elsewhere in England. Edited by J. Bain [and later W. K. Boyd]. 9 vols., 1898–1915. [In progress.]

Seccombe–Allen. The Age of Shakespeare. By T. Seccombe and J. W. Allen. 2 vols., 1903.

Secret History. Secret History of the Court of James the First. [Edited by Sir W. Scott.] 2 vols., 1811.

Segar. Honor Military and Civill. By W. Segar. 1602.

Seifert. Wit- und Science-Moralitäten. Von J. Seifert. 1892.

Serlio. Il Primo [–Quinto] Libro d'Architettura. Per Sebastiano Serlio. Venice. 1551.

S. F. T. Old English Plays, Student's Facsimile Edition. Edited by J. S. Farmer. 1909–14.

Sharp. A Short History of the English Stage. By R. F. Sharp. 1909.

Shaw. An Index to the Shakespeare Memorial Library. By A. C. Shaw. 3 Parts, 1900–3. [*Birmingham Free Libraries.*]

Shaw. The Knights of England. By W. A. Shaw. 2 vols., 1906.

Sheavyn. The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age. By P. Sheavyn. 1909. [*Manchester Univ. Publ.*]

Sh. Eng. Shakespeare's England. An Account of the Life and Manners of his Age. [By various Writers.] 2 vols., 1916.

Sh. Homage. A Book of Homage to Shakespeare. Edited by I. Gollancz, 1916.

Sheppard. The Old Royal Palace of Whitehall. By E. Sheppard. 1902.

Sh. Q. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles. Issued under the Superintendence of F. J. Furnivall. 43 vols., [1885]–91.

Sh. Soc. The Shakespeare Society. 1841–53.

Sh. Soc. P. The Shakespeare Society's Papers. 4 vols., 1844, 1845, 1847, 1849.

Simpson. Shakespearian Punctuation. By P. Simpson. 1911.

Simpson. The School of Shakespeare. Edited by R. Simpson. 2 vols., 1878.

Singer. Das bürgerliche Trauerspiel in England. Von H. W. Singer. 1891. [Leipzig diss.]

Sirigatti. La pratica di prospettiva. Per L. Sirigatti. 1596.

Small. The Stage-Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters. By R. A. Small. 1899.

Smith, Gregory. Elizabethan Critical Essays. Edited by G. Gregory Smith. 2 vols., 1904.

Smith. Antiquities of Westminster. By J. T. Smith. 1807.

SMITH. Froissart and the English Chronicle Play. By R. M. Smith. 1915.

SMITH. The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith. By J. Strype. 1698; 2nd ed. 1820.

SMITH. The Commedia dell' Arte; a Study in Italian Popular Comedy. By W. Smith. 1912. [*Columbia Univ. Studies in English.*]

SMYTH, *Berkeleys.* The Lives of the Berkeleys, 1066–1618. 2 vols. Description of the Hundred of Berkeley. 1 vol. By John Smyth of Nibley. Edited by J. Maclean. 1883–6. [*Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society.*]

SOERGEL. Die englischen Maskenspiele. Von A. Soergel. 1882.

S. P. Studies in Philology. Vols. xii–xix, 1915–22. [*University of North Carolina.* In progress.]

S. P. D. Calendar of State Papers: Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I. Edited by R. Lemon [and later, M. A. E. Green]. 12 vols., 1856–72.

SPEDDING. The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon, including all his Occasional Works. By J. Spedding. 7 vols., 1861–74. [Vols. viii–xiv of *Works.*]

S. P. F. Calendar of State Papers: Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth. Edited by J. Stevenson [and later, A. J. Crosby, A. J. Butler, and S. C. Lomas]. 18 vols., 1863–1914. [In progress.]

SPINGARN. A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance. By J. E. Spingarn. 1899.

SPINGARN. Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century. Edited by J. E. Spingarn. 2 vols., 1908.

Sp. P. Calendar of Letters and State Papers, relating to English Affairs, principally in the Archives of Simancas. Edited by M. A. S. Hume. 4 vols., 1892–99.

S. R. Stationers' Register. *See* ARBER; EYRE.

STÄHLIN. Sir Francis Walsingham und seine Zeit. Von C. Stählin. Vol. i only published, 1908.

Statutes. Statutes of the Realm, 1101–1713. 9 vols., 1810–22. [*Record Commission.*]

STEPHENSON. Shakespeare's London. By H. T. Stephenson. 1905.

STEPHENSON. The Elizabethan People. By H. T. Stephenson. 1910.

STIEFEL. Die Nachahmung spanischer Komödien in England unter den ersten Stuarts. Von A. L. Stiefel. 1890. [*Romanische Forschungen*, v.]

Stiffkey MSS. The Official Papers of Sir Nathaniel Bacon. By H. W. Saunders. 1915. [3 *C. S.* xxvi.]

STOLL. John Webster. The Periods of his Work as determined by his Relations to the Drama of his Day. By E. E. Stoll. 1905.

STOPES. Burbage and Shakespeare's Stage. By C. C. Stopes. 1913.

STOPES. Shakespeare's Environment. By C. C. Stopes. 1914.

STOPES. The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton. By C. C. Stopes. 1922.

STOPES, *Hunnis.* William Hunnis and the Revels of the Chapel Royal. By C. C. Stopes. 1910. [*Materialien*, xxix.]

STOWE. Annales, or, A General Chronicle of England. Begun by J. Stow.

Continued and Augmented unto 1631 by E. Howes. 1580, 1592, 1605, 1615 (usually cited), 1631.

Stowe, *Survey*. A Survey of London. By John Stow, 1598, &c. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 2 vols., 1908.

Strickland. The Life of Queen Elizabeth. By A. Strickland. 1906. [*Everyman's Library*, reprint from *Lives of the Queens of England*, 1840–8.]

Stubbes. The Anatomie of Abuses. By Phillip Stubbes. 1583. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. 2 Parts, 1877–82. [*N. S. S.*]

Stubbs. The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development. By W. Stubbs. 3 vols., 1866, &c., 1880, 1903–6.

Sullivan. Court Masques of James I. By M. Sullivan. 1913.

Sully. Mémoires de Maximilien de Béthune, Duc de Sully. 2 vols., 1850. [J. F. Michaud et J. J. F. Poujoulat, *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires*, ii. 2, 3.] *Translation* by C. Lennox. 4 vols., 1877–92.

Swinburne. The Age of Shakespeare. By A. C. Swinburne. 1908.

Sykes. Sidelights on Shakespeare. By H. D. Sykes. 1919.

Symmes. Les Débuts de la critique dramatique en Angleterre jusqu'à la mort de Shakespeare. Par H. S. Symmes. 1903.

Symonds. Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama. By J. A. Symonds. 1884; 2nd ed. 1900.

Sy. P. Letters and Memorials of State. Written and Collected by Sir Henry Sydney, Sir Philip Sydney, Sir Robert Sydney, &c. By A. Collins. 2 vols., 1746.

Taine. History of English Literature. By H. A. Taine. Translated by H. Van Laun. New ed., 4 vols., 1890.

Taylor, John. All the Workes of John Taylor (1630). 1 vol. The Works not included in the Folio of 1630. 5 vols., 1869–78. [*Spenser Soc.*]

T. D. The Temple Dramatists. 1896–1905.

T. F. T. The Tudor Facsimile Texts. Edited by J. S. Farmer. 184 vols. [?], 1907–13.

Thaler. Shakspere to Sheridan. By A. Thaler. 1922.

Thomas. Notes of Materials for the History of Public Departments. By F. S. Thomas. 1846.

Thomas. The Ancient Exchequer of England. By F. S. Thomas. 1848.

Thompson. Shakespeare's Handwriting. By Sir E. M. Thompson. 1916.

Thompson. The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage. By E. N. S. Thompson. 1903. [*Yale Studies in English*, xx.]

Thompson. The English Moral Plays. By E. N. S. Thompson. 1910. [Extract from *Trans. of Connecticut Academy*, xiv.]

Thoms. The Book of Court. By J. Thoms. 1838.

Thornbury. Shakspere's England. By G. W. Thornbury. 2 vols., 1856.

Thorndike. The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare. By A. H. Thorndike. 1901.

Thorndike. Shakespeare's Theater. By A. H. Thorndike. 1916.

Tittmann. Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland. Von J. Tittmann. 1880.

T. L. S. The Times Literary Supplement. 1902–23. [In progress.]

TOLMAN. The Views about Hamlet, and other Essays. By A. H. Tolman. 1904.

TOUT. The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History. By T. F. Tout. 1914.

TOUT. Chapters on the Administrative History of Mediaeval England. By T. F. Tout. Vols. i and ii, 1920. [In progress.]

TRAILL. Social England. Edited by H. D. Traill. 6 vols., 1893–7, &c.; illustrated ed. by H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann. 6 vols., 1901–4.

TREVELYAN. England under the Stuarts. By G. M. Trevelyan. [1904.]

TROTTER. Seventeenth-Century Life in the Country Parish, with special Reference to Local Government. By E. Trotter. 1919.

Tudor Revels. See CHAMBERS.

UNDERHILL. Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors. By J. G. Underhill. 1899.

VAN DAM–STOFFEL. William Shakespeare, Prosody and Text. By B. A. P. van Dam and C. Stoffel. [1900.]

VAN DAM–STOFFEL. Chapters on English Printing, Prosody, and Pronunciation, 1559–1700. By B. A. P. van Dam and C. Stoffel. 1902.

Variorum. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. With a Life of the Poet and an Enlarged History of the Stage. By the late E. Malone. Edited by J. Boswell. 21 vols., 1821. [Vol. iii also contains Chalmers's *Account of the English Stage.*]

Various MSS. Reports on Manuscripts in various Collections. Vols. i–viii, 1901–14. [*Hist. MSS.*]

VELASCO. Viaje de Juan Fernandez de Velasco á Inglaterra para tratar de las paces, 1603. [*Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, lxxi.]

V. H. The Victoria History of the Counties of England. Edited by W. Page and others. 1900–14. (In progress.) [Published separately for each county, including London.]

VON RAUMER. History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, illustrated by Original Documents. By F. von Raumer. 2 vols., 1835.

V. P. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of North Italy. Edited by R. Brown [and later, G. C. Bentinck, H. F. Brown, and A. B. Hinds. 23 vols., 1864–1921. [In progress.]

WALLACE. The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare, with a History of the First Blackfriars Theatre. 1912. [Cited as Wallace, i.]

WALLACE. The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars. By C. W Wallace. 1908. [Cited as Wallace, ii.]

WALLACE. Advance Sheets from Shakespeare, the Globe, and Blackfriars. By C. W. Wallace. 1909. [Privately printed.]

WALLACE. Globe Theatre Apparel. By C. W. Wallace. 1909. [Privately printed.]

WALSINGHAM. The Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, 1570–83. By C. T. Martin. 1870. [*Camden Miscellany*, vi.]

WARD. History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne. By A. W. Ward. 2 vols., 1875; 2nd ed., 3 vols., 1899.

WARNER–BICKLEY. Catalogue of the Manuscripts and Muniments at

Dulwich. [Vol. i.] By G. F. Warner. 1881. Vol. ii. By F. B. Bickley. 1903.

WEGENER. Die Bühneneinrichtung des Shakespeareschen Theaters. Von R. Wegener. 1907.

WHEATLEY–CUNNINGHAM. London Past and Present. Based upon the Handbook by P. Cunningham. By H. B. Wheatley. 3 vols. 1891.

WHEELER. Six Plays by Contemporaries of Shakespeare. By C. B. Wheeler. 1915. [*World's Classics.*]

WIFFEN. Historical Memoirs of the House of Russell. By J. H. Wiffen. 2 vols., 1833.

WILBRAHAM. Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, 1593–1616. By H. S. Scott. 1902. [*Camden Miscellany*, x.]

WILLIAMS. Annals of the Company of Founders. By W. M. Williams. [1867.]

WILSON. The History of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of King James I. By A. Wilson. 1653 [reprinted in *Compleat History of England* (1706), ii].

WILSON. Life in Shakespeare's England. A Book of Elizabethan Prose. By J. D. Wilson. 1911.

WILSON. The Copy for Hamlet, 1603, and the Hamlet Transcript, 1593. By J. D. Wilson. 1918.

WILSON. Queen Elizabeth's Maids of Honour and Ladies of the Privy Chamber. By V. A. Wilson. 1922.

WINSTANLEY. Lives of the most Famous English Poets, or the Honour of Parnassus. By William Winstanley. 1687.

WINWOOD. Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. Collected (chiefly) from the Original Papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood. By E. Sawyer. 3 vols., 1725.

Wisconsin Sh. Studies. Shakespeare Studies by Members of the Department of English of the University of Wisconsin. 1916.

WITHINGTON. English Pageantry. By R. Withington. 2 vols., 1918, 1920.

WORP. Geschiedenis van het Drama en van het Tooneel in Nederland. Van J. A. Worp. 2 vols., 1904–8.

WOTTON. The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton. By L. Pearsall Smith. 2 vols., 1907.

WRIGHT. Queen Elizabeth and her Times. A Series of Original Letters. Edited by T. Wright. 2 vols., 1838.

WRIGHT, JAMES. See *Hist. Hist.*

WYNNE. The Growth of English Drama. By A. Wynne. 1914.

YOUNG. Annals of the Barber-Surgeons. By S. Young. 1890.

YOUNG. The History of Dulwich College, with a Life of the Founder, Edward Alleyn, and an Accurate Transcript of his Diary, 1617–22. By W. Young. 2 vols., 1889.

Zurich Letters. The Zurich Letters : Correspondence of English Bishops with Helvetian Reformers during the Reign of Elizabeth. By H. Robinson. 2 vols., 1842–5. [*Parker Soc.* vii, xviii.]

BOOK I

THE COURT

See where she comes, lo! where,
  In gaudy green arraying,
A prince of beauty rich and rare
  Pretends to go a-Maying.

Triumphs of Oriana.

I

ELIZABETH AND JAMES

[*Bibliographical Note.*—The formal history of the period is covered, with the exception of the years 1588–1603, by J. A. Froude, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Armada* (1856–70), and S. R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War* (1863–84). A beginning towards filling the gap has been made in vol. i of E. P. Cheyney, *History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth* (1914), in which the organization of the court and administration is very fully treated. For specifically social history may be added J. R. Green, *History of the English People* (1877–80), an expansion of the same writer's *Short History of the English People* (1874), and H. D. Traill, *Social England* (1893–7). Shorter surveys are A. D. Innes, *England under the Tudors* (1905), A. F. Pollard, *History of England, 1547–1603* (1910), G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts* (1904), F. C. Montague, *History of England, 1603–60* (1907), all with detailed bibliographies, of which Professor Pollard's is notably full and good. The chief contemporary chronicles are those of Holinshed (1577), Stowe (1580, &c.), and Camden (1615–25), while personalia and Court details are preserved in R. Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia* (1641), J. Finett, *Philoxenis* (1656), E. Bohnn, *Character of Queen Elizabeth* (1693), and the malicious pamphlets collected by Sir W. Scott in his *Secret History of the Court of James the First* (1811). Court life is the main theme of L. Aikin, *Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth* (1818) and *Memoirs of the Court of James I* (1822), and of A. Strickland, *The Life of Queen Elizabeth* (1840), while the best biographical studies of the sovereigns are E. S. Beesly, *Queen Elizabeth* (1892), M. Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth* (1896), and T. F. Henderson, *James I* and *VI* (1904). Court ceremonies are treated in J. Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth* (2nd ed., 1823). Contemporary England is pictured in W. Harrison, *Description of Britain* (1577), and W. B. Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners* (1865), and the extracts in J. D. Wilson, *Life in Shakespeare's England* (1911). The studies of social details in N. Drake, *Shakespeare and his Times* (1817), and G. W. Thornbury, *Shakspere's England* (1856), are now superseded by the combined work of many collaborators in *Shakespeare's England* (1916), where special bibliographies on numerous subjects will be found. Shorter books of interest are H. Hall, *Society in the Elizabethan Age* (1886), H. T. Stephenson, *The Elizabethan People* (1910), and P. H. Ditchfield, *The England of Shakespeare* (1917). London may be specially studied in C. L. Kingsford's edition (1908) of J. Stowe's *Survey of London* (1598) and in W. J. Loftie, *History of London* (1883), H. B. Wheatley, *London Past and Present* (1891), T. F. Ordish, *Shakespeare's London* (1904), W. Besant, *London in the Time of the Stuarts* (1903), *London in the Time of the Tudors* (1904), *London South of the Thames* (1912), H. T. Stephenson, *Shakespeare's London* (1905), J. A. de Rothschild, *Shakespeare and his Day* (1906), H. A. Harben, *A Dictionary of London* (1918), and the publications of the *London Topographical Society*; Westminster in J. T. Smith, *Antiquities of Westminster* (1807), and E. Sheppard, *The Old Royal Palace of Whitehall* (1902); and the royal houses generally in F. Chapman, *Ancient Royal Palaces in and near London* (1902), R. S. Rait, *Royal Palaces*

of England (1911), A. W. Clapham and W. H. Godfrey, *Some Famous Buildings and their Story* (1913), and the numerous monographs cited in the notes to the present chapter. Perhaps the most useful books of general reference are *The Dictionary of National Biography*, G. E. C[okayne]'s *Complete Peerage*, W. A. Shaw's *The Knights of England*, and *The Victoria History of the Counties of England*.

Behind and beyond these treatises, much social and personal material is available in prints or abstracts of official and private letters and analogous documents. The following is not an exhaustive list of sources. There are the *Calendars of State Papers*, of which the *Domestic*, *Foreign*, *Scottish*, *Spanish*, and *Venetian Papers* are the most valuable. There are the Privy Council minutes in J. R. Dasent, *Acts of the Privy Council* (1890–1907), and those of the Welsh Council in R. Flenley's *Calendar* (1916). There is, unfortunately, no collection of the letters missive of Elizabeth. There are full texts, by no means only of treaties, in T. Rymer's *Foedera* (1704–35). Proclamations are calendared in R. Steele, *Bibliography of Royal Proclamations* (1910–11), and London civic correspondence in *Analytical Index to the Remembrancia* (1878). There are the *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, covering private collections, of which the *Hatfield MSS.* (papers of Lord Burghley and Sir R. Cecil) are by far the most important, while the *Rutland MSS.*, *Loseley MSS.* (Sir T. Cawarden and Sir W. More), *Pepys MSS.* (Earl of Leicester), *Finch MSS.* (Sir T. Heneage), and *Middleton MSS.* are also useful. With these may be classed J. E. Jackson, *Longleat Papers* (*Wilts. Archaeological Magazine*, xiv, xviii, xix), I. H. Jeayes, *Catalogue of the Muniments at Berkeley Castle* (1892, George Lord Hunsdon), and H. W. Saunders, *Stiffkey MSS.* (1915, Sir Nathaniel Bacon). There is a long series of collections of letters from the seventeenth century onwards, in some of which the interest is mainly diplomatic, in others ecclesiastical, in others again personal; *Cabala* (1654, Lord Burghley), D. Digges, *The Compleat Ambassador* (1655, Sir F. Walsingham), E. Sawyer, *Winwood Memorials* (1725), F. Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa* (1732), A. Collins, *Sydney Papers* (1746), T. Birch, *Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth* (1754, Anthony Bacon), S. Haynes and W. Murdin, *A Collection of State Papers* (1740–59, Lord Burghley), L. Howard, *A Collection of Letters* (1753), H. Harington, *Nugae Antiquae* (1769, 1804, Sir J. Harington), Earl of Hardwicke, *Miscellaneous State Papers* (1778), E. Lodge, *Illustrations of British History and Manners* (1791, 1838), A. Clifford, *Sadleir Papers* (1809), H. Ellis, *Original Letters Illustrative of English History* (1825–46), A. J. Kempe, *Loseley MSS.* (1835), T. Wright, *Queen Elizabeth and her Times* (1838), G. Goodman, *Court of King James I* (1839), J. P. Collier, *Egerton Papers* (1840, Sir T. Egerton), H. Robinson, *Zurich Letters* (1842–5), T. Birch, *Court and Times of James I* (1848), J. Bruce, *Letters of Elizabeth and James I* (1849), J. Bruce and T. T. Perowne, *Correspondence of M. Parker* (1853), S. Williams, *Letters of John Chamberlain* (1861), I. H. Jeayes, *Letters of Philip Gawdy* (1906). There are biographies, in which also collections of letters are often included; J. Smyth, *Lives of the Berkeleys* (*c.* 1618), *Memoirs of Robert Carey* (1577–1627), J. Strype, *Sir T. Smith* (1698), T. Birch, *Henry Prince of Wales* (1760), N. H. Nicolas, *William Davison* (1823), E. Nares, *William Cecil Lord Burghley* (1828–31), J. H. Wiffen, *The House of Russell* (1833), J. W. Burgon, *Sir T. Gresham* (1839), N. H. Nicolas, *Sir C. Hatton* (1847), W. B. Devereux, *The Devereux, Earls of Essex* (1853), J. Spedding, *Francis Bacon* (1861–74), E. Edwards, *Sir W. Raleigh* (1868), E. T. Bradley, *Arabella Stuart* (1889), B. C. Hardy, *Arbella Stuart* (1913), E. Gosse, *John Donne* (1899), L. P. Smith, *Sir H. Wotton* (1907), Mrs. A. Richardson, *The Lover of Queen Elizabeth* (1907), A. H. Mathew

and A. Calthrop, *Sir T. Matthew* (1907), C. Stählin, *Sir F. Walsingham und seine Zeit* (1908), M. A. E. Green, *Elizabeth Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia* (1909), A. Cecil, *Sir R. Cecil, Earl of Salisbury* (1915). The Camden Society has published the diaries of John Dee (1842), Henry Machyn (1848), John Manningham (1868), Sir Francis Walsingham (1870), and Sir Roger Wilbraham (1902). Finally the ambassadorial dispatches analysed in the calendars are supplemented, for Scotland by Sir James Melville's *Memoirs* (1827), for the Netherlands by J. Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre* (1882–1900), for Spain by the *Correspondencia de Felipe II con sus embajadores en Inglaterra* (*C. D. I.* lxxxvii, lxxxix–xcii) and the *Viaje de Juan Fernandez de Velasco á Inglaterra* (*C. D. I.* lxxxi), and for France by many publications, of which C. P. Cooper, *Correspondance diplomatique de La Mothe Fénelon* (1838–75), the *Mémoires* (1850) of the Duc de Sully, and *Ambassades de M. de la Boderie en Angleterre* (1750) are the richest in court detail.]

At the close of the Middle Ages, the mimetic instinct, deep-rooted in the psychology of the folk, had reached the third term of its social evolution. After colouring the liturgy of the Church and the festival celebrations of the municipal guilds, it had attached itself, in an outgrowth of minstrelsy, to the household of the sovereign, which had now definitely become, with the advent of the Tudors, the centre of the intellectual and artistic life of the country. It will be manifest, in the course of the present treatise, that the palace was the point of vantage from which the stage won its way, against the linked opposition of an alienated pulpit and an alienated municipality, to an ultimate entrenchment of economic independence. On the literary side the *milieu* of the Court had its profound effect in helping to determine the character of the Elizabethan play as a psychological hybrid, in which the romance and the erudition, dear to the bower and the library, interact at every turn with the robust popular elements of farce and melodrama. It is worth while, therefore, to attempt to recover something of the atmosphere of the Tudor Court, and to define the conditions under which the presentation of plays formed a recurring interest in its bustling many-coloured life.

In every court the personality of the sovereign is naturally a dominant factor. Who shall say with what bitter discretion learnt in the hard school of adversity, or with what burden of secret policy for the shaping of the nation's destiny in critical hours, Elizabeth mounted the steps of her throne when her summons came in 1558. Our concern, at least, is with externalities. Elizabeth, at twenty-five, was a young and attractive queen, with her full share of the sensuous Tudor blood, and of her father's early gust for colour and for amusement, for jewels and for pageantry. 'Regina tota

amoribus dedita est venationibusque, aucupiis, choreis et rebus ludicris insumens dies noctesque,' wrote one of her own subjects in 1563; and the dispatches of the Spanish and Venetian diplomatists strike the same note.[1] Although these things had their appeal for her to the end, she was perhaps not so utterly absorbed in them, even at the beginning, as the observers thought. Yet it was assuredly the love of excitement and spectacle, no less than the desire to win the heart of London, that led her to encourage by her presence the revived folk-festivals of the citizens and the lawyers, the morris dances and May-games by land and water, and the Midsummer watch, which she hurried from Richmond to behold *incognita* from the Earl of Pembroke's house at Baynard's Castle. There was much talk of marriage for her in these early years. Philip of Spain himself, incredible as it now sounds, the Kings of Denmark and Sweden, the Archdukes Charles and Ferdinand of Austria, the Duke of Nemours, the Earl of Arran, and of her own subjects, the Earl of Arundel, Lord Robert Dudley, Sir William Pickering, were some of the possible consorts whose names passed from mouth to mouth. The gaiety of Whitehall was enhanced by the outward show of courtship, the embassies and their trains, the gifts and compliments, the receptions and banquets. But it soon became apparent that, from policy or from temperament, the Queen had no serious intention of trusting herself in marriage. Gradually the troops of suitors faded away. Dudley alone was left, and with Dudley the Tudor lack of reticence, which had already brought Elizabeth into trouble as a girl, permitted familiarities wherein hostile and interested critics soon found material for a scandal. Whether her heart or her senses, now or at any time, were touched cannot be said. After all, Dudley had, as time went on, to share her favours, such as they were, with Hatton and with Oxford, with Heneage and with Raleigh and with Blount. But it is to our purpose that, when the embassies were gone, and Elizabeth became more and more involved in the web of political intrigues, and began to lose her looks and her health, the court which had started so brilliantly might well have sunk into the commonplace of middle age, had it not been for the presence of a band of high-spirited youths, bound in the interests of their careers to maintain the traditions of official gallantry, and above all to incur no small expense in leading the revels for the recreation of an imperious and critical

[1] Francis to Sir Thomas Chaloner (Dec. 1563) in Froude, vii. 92; cf. *Sp. P.* i. 10, 127; *V. P.* vii. 80, 101.

mistress. For although Elizabeth loved magnificence, she loved economy more. The repair of a ruined exchequer was one of the primary objects and triumphs of her statecraft. Her household, although stately, was by no means on her father's, or even her sister's, scale of expenditure. The splendours of her jewel-house and even of her wardrobe largely owed their origin to the *strenae* of successive New Years. A similar policy governed the ordering of her amusements. Her Christmas annals afford no parallels to the costly masks, with their marvels of architectural decoration, which had glorified the court of Henry and were to glorify that of James. Her masks, at least those she paid for, were dances, not pageants. The great spectacles of the reign were liturgies, undertaken by her gallants, or by the nobles whose country houses she visited in the course of her annual progresses. The most famous of all, the 'Princely Pleasures of Kenilworth' in 1575, was at the expense of Dudley, to whom the ancient royal castle had long been alienated. Gradually, no doubt, the financial stringency was relaxed. Camden notes a growing tendency to luxury about 1574; others trace the change to the coming of the Duke of Alençon in 1581.[1] Elizabeth had found the way to evoke a national spirit, and at the same time to fill her coffers, by the encouragement of piratical enterprise, and the sumptuous entertainments prepared for the welcome of Monsieur were paid for out of the spoils brought back by Drake in the *Golden Hind*.[2] The Alençon negotiations, whether seriously intended or not, represent Elizabeth's last dalliance with the idea of matrimony. They gave way to that historic pose of unapproachable virginity, whereby an elderly Cynthia, without complete loss of dignity, was enabled to the end to maintain a sentimental claim upon the attentions, and the purses, of her youthful servants. The strenuous years, which led up to the final triumph over the Armada in 1588, spared but little room for revels and for progresses. They left Elizabeth an old woman. But with the removal of the strain the spirit of gaiety awoke. The entertainments during the progresses of 1591 and 1592 hardly yield to those of 1575 in the cost and ingenuity of their symbolical devices. Essex, the darling of these later years, perhaps found it easier to keep the court alive with tilts and masks, than to play his required part in the sentimental comedy. The love of the dance endured with Elizabeth

[1] Camden (tr.), 179; Bohun, 345, from R. Johnston, *Hist. rerum Brit.* (1655), 353; Carey, 2.
[2] *Sp. P.* iii. 91.

to the verge of the grave. Her share in the Twelfth Night revels of 1599 was reported to Spain with the sarcastic comment that 'the head of the Church of England and Ireland was to be seen in her old age dancing three or four gaillards'. A year or so later, she was still dancing 'gayement et de belle disposition' at the wedding of Anne Russell, and in April 1602 she trod two gaillards with the Duke of Nevers.[1] It was near the end of her life, too, when her desire to see Falstaff in love inspired Shakespeare, to the regret of those who sentimentalize over Falstaff, with the racy English farce of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. During these last years of all, there was a touch of fever in her restless activity. She needed much entertainment both within doors and without in the course of 1600, and her wearied statesmen resented the arduousness of the progress upon which she resolved on the verge of sixty-seven. She went a-Maying at Highgate in 1601 and at Lewisham in 1602. During the next winter her councillors provided a special series of festivities, with the object of inducing her to spend Christmas in London, instead of at Richmond; and we learn that the Court 'flourisht more then ordinarie' with plays, only a month before the indomitable lady took to her bed, and died of no very clearly ascertained disease, but in 'a settled and unremoveable melancholy'.

When James came to London he adopted the traditional splendours of the English Court, in place of the simpler style of living to which he had been accustomed in Edinburgh. His scale of expenditure, indeed, was from the beginning far in excess of Elizabeth's, and landed him before long in considerable embarrassment of the purse. For this there were various reasons: the necessity of keeping up supplementary establishments for a queen consort and an heir apparent, the personal inclination of Anne of Denmark for ostentatious prodigality, the crowd of hungry Scots demanding provision for their needs; above all, no doubt, the absence of any statesmanlike instinct for financial control. There is plenty of evidence that the dignity and sobriety which, on the whole, had characterized Elizabeth's Court soon vanished under the lax rule of her successors. But extravagance and wantonness, although deplorable in themselves, are not necessarily unfriendly to the arts. The transference of the leading companies of players to the direct service of the royal households made it clear that the drama would occupy no less

[1] *Sp. P.* iv. 650; Chamberlain, 99, 126; *Hatfield MSS.* xii. 253; Boissise, i. 415; Beaumont, 21; Goodman, i. 17.

important a place in the new order of things than it had done in the old. And in fact the yearly tale of performances at court soon doubled and trebled that which had sufficed for the Christmas 'solace' of Elizabeth. Doubtless the King had some personal taste for the drama, though perhaps less than other members of his family.[1] He had long entertained the English actor, Laurence Fletcher, into his service and shown him high favour, and Jonson is our authority for the statement that Shakespeare's plays did 'take', not only 'Eliza' but 'our James'. But his great preoccupation was the hunt, to which he hurried on every opportunity, regardless of the discontent of London and even of the claims of business. Anne, on the other hand, brought up in a court which had been one of the first to come under the influence of the English players abroad, and wedded into a court from which the Kirk had never succeeded in expelling the French habits of amusement domiciled by Mary Queen of Scots, found her chief pleasure in the spectacular arts; and to her influence is mainly due that great development of the Jacobean mask, which gave such scope to the exercise of courtly pens, and to the remarkable decorative genius of Inigo Jones.[2] Anne's interest in all forms of the drama, which even led her to the innovation of visiting a theatre, was fully shared by the royal children, and combined in Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, with a passion for the knightly exercise of the tilt to prolong into the seventeenth century the Renaissance tradition of spectacular feats of arms. The death of this beloved prince, to whom the thoughts of England, disillusioned of his father, turned as the hope of the future, fell near the end of our period. The splendour of the Court festivities reached a climax with the wedding of the Princess Elizabeth in 1613, and faded even before the death of Anne herself in 1619. It had its revival under Henrietta Maria.

The Court was a movable institution, constituted by the actual presence of the sovereign. Abundant choice both of 'standing houses' or 'houses of abode' and of country

[1] Carleton to Chamberlain, Jan. 15, 1604 (*S. P. D., Jac. I*, vi. 21): 'The first holy dayes we had every night a publicke play in the great hale, at which the king was ever present, and liked or disliked as he saw cause; but it seems he takes no extraordinary pleasure in them. The Queen and Prince were more the players frends, for on other nights they had them privately, and hath since taken them to theyr protection.'

[2] J. A. Lester, *Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama* in *Haverford Essays* (1909).

manors was available.[1] The most important palaces, under Elizabeth, were five in number, Whitehall, Hampton Court, Greenwich, Richmond, and Windsor. All of these stood upon the river, and all except Windsor and in part Greenwich dated structurally from the reign of Henry VII or that of Henry VIII. The ancient palace of Westminster, with its royal chapel of St. Stephen and its great hall built by William Rufus and rebuilt by Richard II, served for coronations and for the housing of Parliament and the courts of justice. But it was no longer used as a royal residence, and the name of one of its principal chambers, the 'white hall', had been transferred to the neighbouring structure of York Place, originally begun by Wolsey, and surrendered to Henry VIII, a fruitless sacrifice, at the moment of the great Cardinal's downfall in 1530.[2] This was the metropolitan palace. It was an extensive and irregular pile, covering many acres. Through its centre ran the highway from London to Westminster, piercing two arched gateways, of which the northern one was the work of Holbein. The hall and chapel, with the royal lodgings, galleries, and privy garden, stood on the east, and were connected with the river by a flight of privy stairs. On the west, reached by galleries over the gateways, were many additional lodgings, grouped round a cockpit, a tennis-court, and a tilt-yard. At the back of these lay St. James's Park.[3] Richmond and Hampton Court, a few miles up the river, and Greenwich, a few miles down, were all accessible by river as well as by road, and the royal barge lay ready in its bargehouse opposite Whitehall, off Paris Garden on the Surrey side. Both for Court and city the Thames was a frequented water-way. Richmond had been

[1] Scaramelli wrote to the Signory in July 1603 (*V. P.* x. 71) that James had eight palaces on the Thames, of which Hampton Court was the biggest. Each had its own furniture, which was never taken to furnish another. I suppose the eight must be Whitehall, St. James's, Somerset House, the Tower, Greenwich, Richmond, Hampton Court, and Windsor. Letters of 1602, when Elizabeth was at Oatlands, contemplate her return to 'Richmond or some other of her houses of abode' and to 'a standing house' (*Hatfield MSS.* xii. 385, 448). I suppose that these were the permanently furnished houses.

[2] Cheyney, i. 143, says that the Exchequer court near Westminster Hall, the gallery of which was built or repaired in 1570, 'served the queen and court not infrequently as a ball-room'; but this is only an old tradition, for which Smith, *Westminster*, 54, could find no confirmation in 1807, and for which the records of Court entertainments certainly furnish none.

[3] The accounts of Smith and Sheppard (cf. *Bibl. Note*) may be supplemented from W. R. Lethaby in *Archaeologia*, lx. 131; *London Topographical Record*, i. 38; ii. 23; vi. 23, 35; vii. *passim*. Von Wedel (*2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 234) describes the palace in 1584.

built by Henry VII to replace the older palace of Sheen, destroyed by fire in 1497.[1] Hampton Court, also upon the site of an earlier royal manor-house, was like Whitehall a monument of the architectural taste of Wolsey, and like Whitehall became part of the spoil of Henry VIII, by whom it was completed.[2] Greenwich owed its origin to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, who gave it the name of 'Placentia' or 'Pleasaunce'. It had been enlarged by Henry VII and was the birthplace and the favourite habitation of Henry VIII.[3] Windsor, on the other hand, which stood in a wide hunting domain some score or more of miles up the river, was an ancient fortress of the English kings. William the Conqueror had built it; William of Wykeham had added to it for Edward III, who established the college of St. George within its walls upon an older foundation of Henry I, and made it the habitation of his chivalric Order of the Garter. Elizabeth modified the mediaeval aspect of the castle, by adding a library and a garden terrace.[4]

Some older royal residences in London had long been converted to other purposes. The Tower served as a wardrobe or storehouse and a prison, but was only occupied by the sovereign on the eve of a coronation.[5] The Wardrobe on St. Andrew's Hill was assigned to the Master of the Wardrobe as an office and personal lodging.[6] The Savoy held a hospital, together with various sets of lodgings.[7] Baynard's Castle had been granted to the Herberts, nominally as keepers, in 1546.[8]

[1] E. B. Chancellor, *Historical Richmond* (1885); R. Garnett, *Richmond on the Thames* (1896); Chapman, 123; *Survey* of 1503 in Grose and Astle, *Antiquarian Repertory*; *Survey* of 1649 in Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 412.

[2] E. Law, *History of Hampton Court Palace* (1885–91); W. H. Hutton, *Hampton Court* (1897). De Silva reports to Philip on 13 Oct. 1567 (*Sp. P.* i. 679) that Elizabeth was then at Hampton Court for the first time since her attack of small-pox there in 1562, after which she took a dislike to it. It was the largest of all the palaces, 'with 1800 inhabitable rooms or at least with doors that lock' (*V. P.* x. 71).

[3] A. G. K. L'Estrange, *The Palace and the Hospital: Chronicles of Greenwich* (1886); Chapman, 9. The building is shown in Wyngaerde's drawing of *c.* 1543 (Mitton, I). Hentzner was told in 1598 that it was Elizabeth's preferred abode.

[4] W. H. St. J. Hope, *Windsor Castle* (1913); R. R. Tighe and J. E. Davis, *Annals of Windsor* (1858); E. Ashmole, *The Institution, Lawes and Ceremonies of the Garter* (1672); J. Pote, *History and Antiquities of Windsor Castle* (1749); G. M. Hughes, *Windsor Forest* (1890).

[5] R. Gower, *The Tower of London* (1901–2); Clapham and Godfrey, 29. Elizabeth was there in 1559, 1561, and 1565.

[6] For its mediaeval use as an occasional royal lodging, cf. N. H. Nicolas, *Wardrobe Accounts of Edw. IV*, 121, 127.

[7] W. J. Loftie, *Memorials of the Savoy* (1878); Chapman, 42.

[8] Elizabeth paid visits there in 1559, 1562, 1564, 1566, and 1575.

Crosby Hall was the abode of wealthy merchants.[1] Somerset House, the unfinished palace of the Protector on the Strand, had been made over to Elizabeth as princess by Edward VI in 1552. She sometimes occupied it, in order to be near the city, but more usually kept it available for foreign visitors or favoured courtiers.[2] For the latter purpose it was supplemented by Durham House, farther westwards on the Strand, which Henry VIII had acquired by exchange from the see of Durham in 1536.[3] Most of the ecclesiastical buildings, which had reverted to the Crown on the dissolution of the religious orders, such as the Blackfriars, the Whitefriars, and the Charterhouse, had been alienated.[4] Elizabeth

[1] Chapman, 36; Clapham and Godfrey, 119.

[2] S. Pegge, *Curialia* (1806); R. Needham and A. Webster, *Somerset House, Past and Present* (1905). Elizabeth was there in 1558, 1562, 1571, 1573, 1582, 1583, 1585, 1587, 1588, 1589, 1590, 1593, 1594, and 1599. She gave lodgings there to Somerset's son, the Earl of Hertford, and amongst other guests were the Duke of Holstein (1560), Cornelius de la Noye, an alchemist (1567), the Duke of Montmorency (1572), and the Duke of Mayenne (1600). Conferences were held there with Alençon's commissioners in 1581. In 1574 (*Berkeley MSS.* 223) the keepership was given to Henry Lord Hunsdon, the Lord Chamberlain, who took up his residence there, and after his death to Lady Hunsdon. In early documents of the reign, the name Strand House (*P. C. Acts*, Jan. 1563; *Procl.* 496) or Strand Place (*Procl.* 497) occurs; in the patent of Hunsdon's predecessor John West in 1559 (*Berkeley MSS.* 218) it is 'Somersett Place *al.* Strande House *al.* Somersett House'.

[3] M. A. S. Hume, *A Palace in the Strand* in *The Year after the Armada* (1896), 263; Nichols, *James*, i. 75; Clapham and Godfrey, 151; T. N. Brushfield, *The History of Durham House, London*, in *Trans. of Devon. Assoc.* xxxv. 539. Elizabeth was there in 1565 or 1566. Lodgings were assigned to Alvaro de la Quadra, the Spanish ambassador (1559–63), Cecilia of Sweden, Margravine of Baden (1565), Walter, Earl of Essex (1572), Sir Walter Raleigh (1584–1603), Sir Edward Darcy (*c.* 1600–3). In 1603 James turned Raleigh and Darcy out and restored the freehold to Toby Mathew, Bishop of Durham, who retained the river front, and leased the Gatehouse on the Strand. The lease passed to Lord Salisbury, who built there the New Exchange or Britain's Burse in 1609.

[4] L. Hendriks, *The London Charterhouse* (1889); W. F. Taylor, *The Charterhouse of London* (1912). The Charterhouse, after temporary use as a storehouse for the Tents (cf. *Tudor Revels*, 13), was granted to Sir Edward North, afterwards Lord North of Kirtling, in 1545 and the grant was confirmed by Mary in 1554. Elizabeth visited him there in Nov. 1558 and July 1561. After his death in 1564 the second lord kept a house in Charterhouse Square, which passed to the Earls of Rutland and as Rutland House became the scene of Davenant's *First Day's Entertainment* in 1656. The main building was bought in 1565 by Thomas, fourth Duke of Norfolk, and called Howard Place. Elizabeth visited him there in 1568. On his attainder in 1572, she lodged the Portuguese ambassador in the house, but afterwards granted it to Norfolk's son Thomas, Lord Howard of Walden, whom she visited there in Jan. 1603. In 1611 Thomas Sutton bought the Charterhouse from Howard for a hospital. On the Blackfriars and Whitefriars, cf. ch. xvii.

retained the priory of St. John in Clerkenwell, and placed there some of the minor Household offices, including that of the Revels.[1] Somewhat retired from the press of city life lay St. James in the Fields, built on the site of an old leper hospital by Henry VIII in 1532. It ranked almost as a country house. A park, enclosed in 1537 and adorned with the artificial water known as Rosamund's Pool, separated it from Whitehall, and on the other side of it stretched the enclosures of Hyde and Marylebone Parks.[2] There were many country houses still farther afield. Oatlands, on the Surrey border of Windsor Forest, served for hunting.[3] To this, and to Nonsuch in Surrey, the Queen often made resort.[4] Eltham, in Kent, was another hunting ground, convenient of access from Greenwich. Visits were paid from time to time to Havering Bower in Essex, Enfield in Middlesex, Hatfield, where Elizabeth had lived as a princess, in Hertfordshire, the monastic spoil of Reading Abbey in Berkshire, Woodstock in Oxfordshire, and the ancient capital of Winchester in Hampshire.[5] But for the most part these, and yet other royal castles and manors in more distant counties, slept peacefully under the privileged sway of their constables and keepers.[6] There were some changes at the succession of

[1] Clapham and Godfrey, 165; cf. ch. iii.

[2] E. Sheppard, *Memorials of St. James's Palace* (1894). Elizabeth was there in 1561, 1564, 1566, 1571, 1572, 1575, 1576, 1581, 1583, 1584, 1588, and 1593.

[3] *V. H. Surrey*, iii. 478. Elizabeth was there in 1560, 1562, 1564, 1567, 1569, 1570, 1574, 1577, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1587, 1589, 1590, 1591, 1593, 1600, and 1602.

[4] *V. H. Surrey*, iii. 266; *Gent. Mag.* viii. (1837) 139; Clapham and Godfrey, 3. Elizabeth was there in 1559, 1563, 1565, 1567, 1574, 1580–5 (yearly), 1587, 1589, 1591, 1592, 1593, 1594, 1595, 1596, 1598, 1599, 1600. The house was begun by Henry VIII and finished by Lord Lumley, son-in-law of the Earl of Arundel, to whom the property was alienated in 1556. Elizabeth bought the house about 1590–2. 'Nonsuch, which of all other places she likes best,' wrote Rowland White in 1599 (*Sydney Papers*, ii. 120).

[5] For Eltham (visits in 1559, 1560, 1576, 1581, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1599, 1601, 1602), once an important palace, cf. J. C. Buckler, *Account of Eltham* (1828), Chapman, 1, Clapham and Godfrey, 47; for Havering (visits in 1561, 1568, 1572, 1576, 1578, 1579, 1591, 1597), Nichols, *Eliz.* iii. 70, Clapham and Godfrey, 145; for Hatfield (visits in 1558, 1566, 1568, 1571, 1572, 1575, 1576), *V. H. Herts.* iii. 92; for Reading (visits in 1568, 1570, 1572, 1574, 1576, 1592, 1601), J. B. Hurry, *Reading Abbey* (1901), T. J. Pettigrew in *Journal of Brit. Arch. Ass.* xvi. 192; for Woodstock (visits in 1566, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1592), E. Marshall, *Early Hist. of Woodstock Manor* (1873), and ch. xxiii, s.v. Lee. Elizabeth was at Enfield in 1561, 1564, 1568, 1572, 1587, 1591, 1594, 1597, and at Winchester in 1560, 1574, 1591.

[6] Schedules of royal houses and other possessions to which places of profit were attached form part of the Fee Lists described in the *Bibl. Note* to ch. ii. That of 1598 (*H. O.* 262) includes 37 castles under constables,

James. Somerset House was assigned to Queen Anne, and a not very successful attempt was made to re-name it Queen's Court. This appellation was revived when the creation of an Earl of Somerset in 1613 seemed suggestive of confusion, and then abandoned in favour of Denmark House.[1] Nonsuch, Havering, and Hatfield, with many other manors, were also assigned to Anne as part of her dowry. Hatfield was exchanged in 1607 with Lord Salisbury for Theobalds, to which James rather than Anne appears to have taken a fancy, and the transfer gave occasion for a characteristic entertainment by Ben Jonson. Oatlands was given to Anne in 1611 and Greenwich in 1613.[2] At the beginning of the reign Oatlands had been the royal nursery for Henry and Elizabeth, and it continued to be Henry's country home for some years.[3] Elizabeth, however, was soon placed in the charge of Lord Harington, first at Exton in Rutlandshire and then at Combe Abbey in Warwickshire. When she came to Court in 1608, a house was found for her at Kew. Both she and Henry sometimes resided at Hampton Court and at White-

keepers, or porters, 17 other houses, 11 forests, and 8 parks, together with the Fleet prison under a warden keeper, the Baths (at Bath) under a keeper, the Haven of the Duchy of Cornwall under a havenor, the Honour of Tutbury under a steward, and Paris Garden under the keepers of Bears and Mastiffs (cf. ch. xvi, s.v. Hope); in all 78.

[1] Occasionally it was still used as a guesthouse. The Constable of Castile was lodged here in 1604, the Danish ambassador in 1605, Christian of Denmark in 1606 and 1614. Fuller, *Church History*, vii. 46, says that the name Denmark House was adopted by proclamation in honour of King Christian, but I can find no such proclamation. Arthur Wilson (*Compleat Hist.* ii. 685) dates the change *c.* 1610, and says that the new name 'continued her time among her people; but it was afterwards left out of the common calendar, like the dead Emperor's new-named month'. On the other hand I find Cecil dating from 'Queens Court' on 6 March 1605 (*S. P. D.* xiii. 15), Chamberlain writing in Feb. 1614 of the performance of Daniel's *Hymen's Triumph* that it was in a 'little square paved court' at 'Somerset House or Queens Court, as it must now be called' (W. W. Greg in *M. L. Q.* vi. 59, from *Addl. MS.* 4173, ff. 368, 371), and plays acted by Anne's men 'at Queenes Court' in 1615 (cf. App. B). The reason suggested in the text for the second attempt to change the name seems to me a plausible conjecture. Perhaps 'Denmark House' was tried at Christian's second visit in 1614. In any case, neither novelty permanently established itself. The first use of 'Denmark House' I have noticed is in 1615; that of 'Somerset House' was resumed under Charles I.

[2] Lodge, iii. 62; Birch, i. 279; Devon, 63, 176; *V. P.* x. 87; xiii. 81; *S. P. D., Jac. I*, xxvii. 31; lxv. 79, 80; *V. H. Surrey*, iii. 478; *V. H. Herts.* iii. 447; Goodman, i. 174; J. E. Cussans, *Hist. of Herts.*, pts. ix, x. 209; Nichols, *James* ii. 127. Theobalds, in Cheshunt, had been often visited by Elizabeth; cf. App. A. James had already been there yearly in 1603–1606, and found it convenient for Waltham Forest.

[3] Green, 7; *V. P.* x. 71.

hall, where they were lodged in that part of the palace known as the Cockpit, on the border of St. James's Park.[1] But St. James's Palace itself was reserved for the ultimate use of Henry, and here he set up his establishment as Prince of Wales in 1610 and died in 1612. Richmond and Woodstock were given him for country houses, and at his death he was also buying up interests in Sheen House and Kenilworth.[2] For Charles Holdenby or Holmby House in Northamptonshire was bought in 1605, and on his brother's death he succeeded to St. James's.[3] The King was thus left with Whitehall, Hampton Court, and Windsor as his principal palaces. Naturally those of his wife and son remained available for occasional visits, and the hunting facilities of Theobalds and Woodstock were an agreeable addition to those of Hampton Court and Windsor themselves.[4] But they did not suffice for James, who set about providing himself with hunting quarters in various localities. The most important of these was Royston Priory, on the borders of Cambridgeshire and Herts., which he bought after a year's trial in 1604 and enlarged into a house of some pretensions.[5] Others were at Newmarket, Thetford, Hinchinbrook, Ware, and Woking, while stables were kept up at St. Albans and Reading.[6] Theobalds, Royston, and Newmarket were all reached by a private road, maintained, like the King's Road to Hampton Court and another to Greenwich, by James himself.[7]

The arrangement of the principal rooms of a Tudor palace can be well studied on the plan of Hampton Court.[8] There is a great Hall, and at the back of it the entrance to a Great Chamber. At Hampton Court and Richmond this appears to have served also as a Guard or Watching Chamber, but

[1] Green, 8, 17; *V. P.* xii. 194; Pory to Sir Thomas Puckering (3 Jan. 1633) in *Court and Time of Charles I*, ii. 213: 'In case the Queen [of Bohemia] do come for England, I hear that her lodging appointed in court is the Cockpit, at Whitehall, where she lay when she was a maid.' On the Cockpit, cf. ch. vii.

[2] Birch, *Life of Henry*, 330; Cunningham, viii; *V. P.* xii. 194, 207; Devon 153, 164, 179; *S. P. D., Jac. I*, viii. 104; Marshall, *Woodstock*, 174.

[3] Devon, 37, 80; *V. P.* xiii. 81; Birch, i. 41.

[4] James was at Richmond in 1605, 1606, 1607, and 1611, at Oatlands in 1604, 1606, 1607, 1608, 1610, 1611, 1613, and 1615, and at Woodstock in 1603, 1604, 1605, 1610, 1612, and 1614. Some of his hunting trophies are still preserved at Ditchley Park; cf. ch. xxiii, s.v. Lee. Theobalds, like Royston, he visited several times a year. Evidently it was more his than Anne's. In 1607 and 1615 his departure from London is spoken of as going 'home' (Birch, i. 68, 298).

[5] *V. H. Herts.* iii. 253.

[6] *Abstract*, 52.

[7] T. F. Ordish in *L. T. R.* viii. 6. The road crossed Holborn at Kingsgate.

[8] Law, *Hampton Court*, i. 1.

at Whitehall the Guard Chamber and the Great Chamber were distinct.[1] Out of the Great Chamber opens the Presence Chamber, and out of this again the Privy Chamber, which gives admittance to the private apartments of the sovereign. These included one or more Parlours or Withdrawing Chambers, as well as the Bed Chamber.[2] From the opposite end of the Great Chamber runs a gallery, which passes round two sides of a court and leads to the royal Closet, overlooking and forming part of the Chapel. Into this gallery also opens the Council Chamber. The Presence Chamber and the Privy Chamber were the essential elements of the scheme, and had to be contrived, no matter how humbly the Court was lodged.[3] The Presence Chamber seems to have been open to any one who was entitled to appear at Court at all. Access to the Privy Chamber, on the other hand, where Elizabeth dined and supped and sat with her ladies, was jealously reserved for privy councillors and other favoured persons.[4] At Whitehall there were also a Privy Gallery and a Privy Garden, which counted as parts of the Privy Chamber.[5] Occasionally ambassadors or distinguished foreign visitors might have audience there, or even in a Withdrawing Chamber.[6] But ordinarily presentations were made in the Presence Chamber, and here the crowd of courtiers waited on Sundays for the ceremony of the Queen's going to chapel. Paul Hentzner has described the scene as he saw it at Greenwich in 1598.[7]

[1] At the wedding of Princess Elizabeth in 1613 (Rimbault, 163) James went 'from his Privie Chamber, throughe the presence and garde chamber, and throughe a new bankettinge house erected of purpose for to solemnenize this feast in, and so doune a paire of stayers at the upper end therof hard by the Courte gate, wente alonge uppon a stately scaffold to the great chamber stayers, and throughe the greate chamber and lobby to the clossett, doune the staiers to the Chappell'; cf. Pegge, i. 68. Traces of the Great Chamber at Whitehall possibly still exist, over the building known as Cardinal Wolsey's cellar (*L. T. R.* vii. 40).

[2] Davison to Leicester (1586, *Hardwicke Papers*, i. 302): 'I found her majesty alone, retired into her withdrawing chamber'; Lord Talbot to Anon. (1587, *Rutland MSS.* i. 213): 'She had my wife called in to the withdrawing chamber, where no one but the Queen, my Lord, and Secretary Walsingham were'; Sussex to Burghley (1573, 2 Ellis, iii. 27): 'The Queen sate in the grete Closette or Parler [at Greenwich]'; R. Cecil to Essex (1596, Devereux, i. 347), reporting that Sir A. Shirley was 'used with great favour, both in the privy and drawing chambers'. The 'Withdrawing Chamber' of Law's Hampton Court plan appears to be the Privy Chamber. They were certainly distinct at Richmond in 1600, for Vereiken was taken through the Privy Chamber for an audience in the Withdrawing Chamber (*Sydney Papers*, ii. 170).

[3] Cf. ch. iv.

[4] *H. O.* 154 (1526); *Procl.* 962 (1603).

[5] Pegge, i. 68.

[6] *V. P.* vii. 91 (1559, Montmorency); ix. 531 (1603, Scaramelli).

[7] Cf. App. F. Von Wedel (*2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 250) describes the ceremony at Hampton Court in 1584.

In the Presence Chamber, too, Hentzner saw the royal table laid and the ceremony of tasting performed, before the royal dishes were carried to a more private apartment. An ancient custom by which the sovereign occasionally dined in state in the Presence Chamber, and was served by great nobles of the realm upon the knee, from cupboards of massy plate, had fallen into disuse, but was revived by James.[1] In the Hall, or if more convenient in the Great Chamber, plays were given.[2] For this purpose the dimensions, in the larger palaces, were fully adequate. The hall of Hampton Court is 115 ft. × 40 ft., that of Windsor 108 ft. × 33 ft., that of Eltham, locally known as King John's Barn, 100 ft. × 36 ft. These alone survive, but the hall of Richmond is known to have been 100 ft. × 40 ft., and that of Whitehall 100 ft. × 45 ft.[3] But for an exceptional entertainment, such as a great banquet or mask, more space was desirable, and temporary structures, known as banqueting-houses, were erected as required. The device had already been employed by Henry VIII. A banqueting-house had been one of the splendours at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520, and two others, one of which was called the 'long house', or 'disguising house', were decorated by Holbein for the reception of a French embassy at Greenwich in 1527.[4] Edward VI also had had a banqueting-house in Hyde Park for the reception of another French embassy in 1551.[5] In the first year of Elizabeth's reign she used four banqueting-houses, one for the French ambassadors at Westminster in May, two others at Greenwich and Cobham Hall in July,[6] and a fourth at Horsley in August. A later one, prepared at Whitehall in June 1572 for the reception of the Duke of Montmorency, required 116 workmen to decorate it at a cost of £224. It

[1] *V. P.* x. 46, 121; xi. 430; xii. 273, 547; Gawdy, 132; Birch, i. 69; Sully, *Mémoires*, 469. Von Wedel, however, saw Elizabeth dine in state at Greenwich in 1584 (loc. cit., 262).

[2] Cf. ch. vii.

[3] The position of the Hall at Whitehall can be fairly well identified as extending across Horse Guards Avenue; cf. *L. T. R.* vii. 41.

[4] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 189; Reyher, 336.

[5] *Tudor Revels*, 17; *Hatfield MSS.* i. 92, from which it appears that there was one house only, with a kitchen, and also stands in Hyde and Marylebone Parks.

[6] *V. P.* vii. 91; Holinshed, iii. 1510; Machyn, 203: 'The x day of July was set up in Greenwich park a goodly banketting-house made with fir powlles, and deckyd with byrche and all manner of flowers of the feld and gardennes, as roses, gelevors, lavender, marygolds, and all maner of strowhyng erbes and flowrs'; Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 81: 'Robert Truncke-well . . . woorking . . . vppon toe modells of the Masters device for a rowfe and a cobboorde of a bancketinge howse', 97, 106.

was hung with birch and ivy, and garnished with bushels of roses and honeysuckles from the royal gardens.[1] Finally, one even more elaborate was erected, also at Whitehall, for the coming of Alençon's ambassadors in 1581.[2] This, although only constructed of fir and deal, was strong enough to stand until 1606. James then had it pulled down and replaced by a new one of brick and stone, which was ready in time for the Christmas festivities of 1607.[3] This in its turn stood

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 163 : ' The Banketting House made at Whitehall for thentertaynement of the seide duke did drawe the charges ensving for the covering therof with canvasse : the decking therof with birche & ivie : and the ffretting, and garnishing therof, with fflowers, and compartementes, with pendentes & armes paynted & gilded for the purpose. The ffloore therof being all strewed with rose leaves pickt & sweetned with sweete waters &c.' The details include £9 14*s.* 4*d.* ' for flowers broughte into the Cockpitt at White hall with other necessaries, viz. fflowers of all sortes taken vp by comyssion & gathered in the feeldes ', while William Hunnis, who was keeper of the gardens at Greenwich, as well as Master of the Chapel, provided 79 bushels of roses, with pinks, honeysuckles, and privet flowers.

[2] Holinshed, iii. 1315, from *Harleian MS.* 293, f. 217 : ' A banketting house was begun at Westminster, on the south west side of hir maiesties palace of White hall, made in maner and forme of a long square, three hundred thirtie and two foot in measure about ; thirtie principals made of great masts, being fortie foot in length a peece, standing vpright ; betweene euerie one of these masts ten foot asunder and more. The walles of this house were closed with canuas, and painted all the outsides of the same most artificiallie with a worke called rustike, much like to stone. This house had two hundred ninetie and two lights of glasse. The sides within the same house was made with ten heights of degrees for people to stand upon : and in the top of this house was wrought most cunninglie upon canuas, works of iuie and hollie, with pendents made of wicker rods, and garnished with baie, rue, and all maner of strange flowers garnished with spangles of gold, as also beautified with hanging toseans made of hollie and iuie, with all maner of strange fruits, as pomegranats, orenges, pompions, cucumbers, grapes, carrets, with such other like, spangled with gold, and most richlie hanged. Betwixt these works of baies and iuie, were great spaces of canuas, which was most cunninglie painted, the clouds with starres, the sunne and sunne beames, with diuerse other cotes of sundrie sortes belonging to the queenes maiestie, most richlie garnished with gold. There were of all manner of persons working on this house, to the number of three hundred seuentie and fiue : two men had mischances, the one brake his leg, and so did the other. This house was made in three weekes and three daies, and was ended the eighteenth daie of Aprill ; and cost one thousand seuen hundred fortie and foure pounds, nineteene shillings and od monie ; as I was crediblie informed by the worshipfull maister Thomas Graue surueior vnto hir maiesties workes, who serued and gaue order for the same, as appeareth by record.' Stowe, *Annales*, 688, copies Holinshed ; cf. *Sp. P.* iii. 91. Von Wedel (*2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 236) saw the house in 1584, and was told that birds sang in the bushes overhead, while entertainments were in progress. A Record Office was constructed below the banqueting house in 1597 (*Hatfield MSS.* vii. 431).

[3] Camden, *Annalium Apparatus*, 6 (*c.* 12 Oct. 1607), ' Camera con-

until 12 January 1619, when it was destroyed by fire, and in its place arose the stately edifice of Inigo Jones, which still glorifies Whitehall.[1] A supplementary room of more temporary character was put up for the Princess Elizabeth's wedding in 1613.[2]

The mediaeval court had been largely an ambulatory one. The principal feasts, at which the King wore his crown, were generally kept in one of the great cities—Westminster, Winchester, Gloucester; and for the rest of the year the household passed by short 'removes' from castle to castle and manor to manor throughout the realm. For this there were economic as well as political reasons. Many mouths had to be fed, and it was easier and less onerous upon the country to devour one local storehouse after another, than to organize an effective transport from the various sources of supply to a single capital. But with the new political stability and the enhanced royal wealth, which followed the coming of the Tudors, a more settled order of things prevailed. Henceforward the greater part of the year was spent at one or other of the 'standing houses' within reach of the administrative head-quarters on the Thames, and the wanderings were confined to a 'progress' of one or two summer months, during which the sovereign took the air, and hunted, and made his presence familiar to his outlying subjects. Under Elizabeth the year may be said to have begun in the middle of November, when she returned to London, generally by road from one of the Surrey palaces through Chelsea. The event, at any rate during the later years of the reign, almost took rank as a ceremony of state. The Queen came by night, with the Master of the Horse leading her palfrey by the bridle and a great noble carrying the sword. Ambassadors were invited to be present, and the Lord Mayor and citizens were called

vivialis de novo construitur apud Whitehall'; Stowe, *Annales*, 688, 892, 910, 'the beautiful room at Whitehall'; Devon, 44, 302, 'James Acheson . . . hath, by our direction, formed a model for the roof of our Banqueting-house at Whitehall'; *V. P.* xi. 86, 'At the close of the ceremony [mask of Jan. 1608] he said to me that he intended this function to consecrate the birth of the Great Hall which his predecessors had left him built merely in wood, but which he had converted into stone'. But James had been displeased with the building when he first saw it about 16 Sept. 1607 (*S. P. D.* xxviii. 51). Goodman, ii. 176, says that the City had to bear the cost in return for the transfer to them of Blackfriars, Whitefriars, and other liberties (cf. ch. xvii, s.v. Blackfriars).

[1] Chamberlain to Carleton (Birch, ii. 124): 'One of the greatest losses spoken of is the burning of all or most of the writings and papers belonging to the offices of the Signet, Privy Seal, and Council Chamber, which were under it'; cf. Reyher, 342; Goodman, ii. 175, 187.

[2] *V. P.* xii. 533; Stowe, 916; Birch, i. 229; Finett, 11; cf. p. 14.

upon to don their rich gowns and chains and give a torch-light welcome.[1] The date was no doubt determined, partly by the approach of winter, partly by that of Accession Day or, as it was often but incorrectly called, Coronation Day, on 17 November. This anniversary, from 1570 onwards, was kept with a solemn celebration, which appears to have originated spontaneously in or near Oxford, to have been adopted throughout the country, to have been revived during the next reign as an indication of popular discontent with James, and to have been still traceable in the form of a holiday at the Exchequer and at the schools of Westminster and Merchant Taylors in 1827.[2] It was on this day that the tilt-yard of Westminster blazed with the pageantry and rang with the spears of the manhood of England, gathered under the leadership of Sir Henry Lee to do honour to the virgin Queen. The Earl of Essex gave the final touch of flattery to the occasion in 1592 by appearing in his collar of SS, 'a thing unwonted', except on days of the most solemn ceremony.[3] In 1588, after the Armada, Elizabeth ordered a renewal of the tilting upon 19 November, which happened

[1] Stowe, 787, 789, 791; Von Wedel in *2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 256; P. P. Laffleur de Kermaingant, *Mission de Jean de Thumery*, i. 368, both describing the procession at length; *Mission de Christophe de Harlay*, 252, 'la coustume a tousjours esté, et mesmes du temps de la feue Royne de trés heureuse memoire, que les ambassadeurs residens en Angleterre sont priez d'accompagner les roys, lorsqu'ilz retournent en leur ville de Londres, après leur progrès'; Goodman, i. 164, 'The Queen's constant custom was a little before her coronation-day to come from Richmond to London, and to dine with my lord Admiral at Chelsea, and to set out from Chelsea at dark night, where the Lord Mayor and the Aldermen were to meet her'. Precepts by the Lord Mayor and other records of civic expenditure on the receptions are in Arber, i. 510; v. lxxvii; Kitto, 538; Young, *Barber Surgeons*, 108; Welch, *Pewterers*, ii. 33.

[2] Camden, 191, 'Anno iam regni Elizabethae duodecimo feliciter exacto, in quo aureum ut vocarunt diem creduli Pontificii sibi ex ariolorum predictione expectabant, boni omnes per Angliam laetanter triumphabant et xvii Novembris Anniversarium regni inchoati diem, gratiarum actionibus, concionibus per Ecclesias, votis multiplicatis, laetisona campanarum pulsatione, hastiludiis, et festiva quadam laetitia celebrare coeperunt, et in obsequiosi amoris testimonium, dum illa viveret, non destiterunt'; La Mothe, v. 204; Arber, i. 561, 566, 578; *Sydney Papers*, i. 371, 'the Triumphes of her Coronation'; Ellis, II. iii. 160, citing *Pauls Cross Sermon* of T. Holland on 17 Nov. 1599, published 1601, with a *Defence of the Church of England for keeping Queen's Day*, for the origin at Oxford under Vice-Chancellor Cooper, which is perhaps confirmed by the records of the tilt (cf. ch. iv). But the City churches rang their bells on the day before 1570; cf. *Westminster*, 18 (1568), 'ringing for the prosperous reign of the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth'; Kitto, 248, 'ringing for the quene the xvij of November 1569', 269 (1572), 'ringing at the quenes ma^ties chaunginge of her raign', &c. The *Chamber Accounts* for 1595–6 use the term 'Raigne day'. Goodman, i. 98, notes the Jacobean revival.

[3] Birch, *Eliz.* i. 92.

to be St. Elizabeth's day, but this second triumph seems to have been only occasional.[1]

Christmas was ordinarily kept at Whitehall; the occasional substitution of Richmond, Greenwich, Hampton Court, or even Windsor is sometimes to be explained by the prevalence of the plague in London, sometimes perhaps by nothing more than a royal whim. But during the years of strain which preceded the Armada Elizabeth appears to have shunned Whitehall as much as possible, not merely at Christmas but at all times, probably from a sense that her personal security could be better provided for in some more compact and less accessible abode.[2] Whether in Whitehall or elsewhere, the twelve days of Christmas, from the Nativity to the Epiphany, were a season of high revels. I do not find that Elizabeth, like her father and brother, ever appointed a Lord of Misrule, although there is some trace of an election of a King of the Bean on the last and greatest day of all, Twelfth Night.[3] But Twelfth Night itself, with St. Stephen's, St. John's, Innocents', and New Year's Day, were regularly appointed for plays and masks, which often overflowed on to other nights during the period. Sometimes, too, there was another tilt, or a barriers in the hall or banqueting-room. And on New Year's Day it was etiquette for the lords and ladies at Court and many of the officers of the household to present the Queen with the New Year gifts or *strenae* which had been immemorial in European courts since the days of the Roman Empire, while she in turn rewarded the donors with gilt plate from the royal jewel house and distributed largess amongst her personal attendants and other customary recipients.[4]

[1] *Sp. P.* iv. 494; cf. Kitto, 407: 'P^d ye iij^d of November to y^e Parrito^r for a warrant to kepe holy y^e xix^th day At w^ch tyme he^r ma^tie should a gone to Powles'. The ceremony, however, was deferred to 24 Nov. There was also a tilt on 19 Nov. in 1590. Von Wedel (*2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 236, 256) says in 1584 that this was a regular day for tilting; but he also says it was the royal birthday, which was 7 Sept.

[2] I find no prolonged stay at Whitehall between May 1584 and Jan. 1589. If her presence in London was necessary during this period Elizabeth seems to have preferred St. James or Somerset House. She opened Parliament in Feb. 1586 from Lambeth; there were other visits to Lambeth and the Lord Admiral's house (Hance's) in Westminster.

[3] *V. P.* vii. 374 (6 Jan. 1566). Machyn, 273, records a visit to the court of a lord of misrule from the city in 1561.

[4] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 238. Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 108; ii. 65, 249; iii. 1, 445, prints rolls of gifts to and from the Queen for 1562, 1578, 1579, 1589, and 1600 from manuscripts in the British Museum and in private hands. A roll for 1585 is noticed in *Arch.* i. 11. Those for 1563, 1577, 1598, and 1603 appear to be among the *Miscellaneous Rolls of Chancery* in the R. O. (Scargill-Bird[2], 363), but are unprinted. Nichols also prints shorter lists of jewels given to the Queen for a number of years.

The revels were renewed for Candlemas (2 Feb.) and for Shrovetide, either at the Christmas head-quarters or at some other palace to which the Court had meanwhile removed. Some part of the early spring was nearly always spent away from Westminster, and during her later years Elizabeth not infrequently left part of the household behind her and made a short 'by progress' to the house of Lord Burghley at Theobalds or that of Sir Thomas Gresham at Osterley or some other favoured courtier. The rest of the spring and summer was divided between Westminster and the river palaces, to and from which the Queen went by land or water, dining on the way, often at Chelsea or at the house of one John Lacy at Putney, and breaking the long journey from Greenwich to Richmond or Hampton Court by a night's rest, generally at the archiepiscopal abode of Lambeth. It was customary to ring the church bells as she entered or left a parish, and the entries of payments to ringers in the accounts of churchwardens serve as a convenient clue to her comings and goings. Easter, with the distribution of alms and washing of feet on Maundy Thursday, and Whitsuntide were kept as ecclesiastical, rather than secular, feasts. On 23 April, St. George's Day, the Queen went in procession about the Court with the Knights of the Garter and the Chapel in their copes. This was the occasion for the choosing of new knights, but their subsequent installation at a Garter feast took place without the Queen at Windsor, whither they rode in great and costly splendour.[1] During the summer there might be another tilt, and the Queen is recorded to have kept 'Mayings' on 1 May and to have taken part from time to time in other survivals of the ancient folk festivals.[2] About July she started for her 'progress', which might occupy from one to two months, according to her fancy, or if there was to be no regular progress, departed for one of the more sequestered houses, Windsor or Reading, Oatlands or Nonsuch, where she delighted to spend the autumn. During this period fell her birthday, on 7 September.[3]

[1] Machyn, 195, 232, 257, 280, 305; *V. P.* vii. 74; Hawarde, 74, 109; *Sydney Papers*, ii. 44; cf. E. Ashmole, *The Institution of the Order of the Garter* (1672); N. H. Nicolas, *Orders of Knighthood* (1841); G. F. Beltz, *Memorials of the Order of the Garter* (1841). Henri IV was installed by proxy in Apr. 1600, and the attendance of the Admiral's men perhaps implies a play (*Hatfield MSS.* x. 118, 269; Henslowe, i. 120). There are Garter allusions in *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

[2] Cf. Appendix A. The Chamber Accounts show an annual payment for a bonfire on Midsummer Day.

[3] *Westminster*, 19 (1579), &c., and Kitto, 364 (1584), &c., record the ringing of London bells. It can hardly have been a day for tilting (cf. p. 19) as the Court was usually in progress.

The Jacobean calendar underwent certain modifications, largely determined by the King's sporting instincts. James kept his Court for the most part at Whitehall, Hampton Court, and Windsor. After the winter of 1603, when plague held him at Hampton Court, his Christmasses and Shrovetides were invariably at Whitehall, and hither he always proceeded at the end of October, in time for the celebration of All Saints' Day on 1 November.[1] On 5 November was kept, after 1605, the anniversary of Gunpowder Plot, and to this day, in course of time, the winter bonfires of folk custom transferred themselves.[2] The Twelve Nights, with Candlemas and Shrovetide, remained the chief seasons for plays and masks, but the plays were greatly increased in number. One was often given on All Saints' Day (1 Nov.) to usher in the winter, and others were called for at intervals during the winter months. James was also regularly at Whitehall on his Accession Day, 24 March, which, like his predecessor, he honoured with a tilt.[3] He maintained the tradition of the progress, generally choosing the direction of such hunting grounds as Sherwood, Wychwood, the New Forest, or Salisbury Plain; and during the course of his progress, on 5 August, he celebrated another anniversary, that of his delivery from the Gowry conspiracy in 1600. On this day ambassadors were expected to pursue him from London and offer their congratulations.[4] The progress generally ended at Havering early in September.[5] Thereafter the household was established at Windsor or Hampton Court until winter began again. But James's personal life was a far less settled one than that of Elizabeth. He disliked London, and at all times of the year, and wherever the Court might be, he was constantly leaving the greater part of it behind, referring the transaction of business to the Privy Council, and betaking himself with the Master of the Horse

[1] *V. P.* xi. 57, 59, refers to an 'old custom' of keeping All Saints' Day in the city (i.e. Westminster] with the Knights of the Garter and the court; cf. Nichols, *James*, ii. 155. It can only have been a Jacobean custom, for Elizabeth did not as a rule reach Westminster by 1 Nov.

[2] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 124, 248. *V. P.* xii. 237, notes ringing on 5 Nov. 1611. Williams, *Founders*, 86, prints a guild order of 1611 for sermons at Paul's Cross and dinners on 'Coronation' day, 5 Aug. and 5 Nov., as days 'of meeting for the kings majesties sarves'.

[3] Cf. ch. iv.

[4] Camden, *Annalium Apparatus*, 2 (Aug. 1603), 'Indicitur ut hic dies festus celebretur ob Regem à Gowriorum conjuratione liberatum'; cf. Goodman, i. 3; Boderie, i. 283; *V. P.* xii. 26, 196, 409. The question as to the bona fides of the plot commemorated is discussed by A. Lang, *James VI and the Gowrie Mystery* (1902).

[5] Goodman, i. 247.

and Sir Thomas Lake, a clerk of the signet who acted as his private secretary, to Theobalds or Royston, or some other hunting box, at which his favourite pursuit might be conveniently enjoyed. From thence he would hurry back, often for a day or two only, when some office of state or Court ceremony urgently demanded his attendance. There is abundant evidence that this abnormal passion for the chase had much to do with the early unpopularity of James. It led to neglect of business, the grave inconvenience of ministers, excessive purveyance, and the trampling of crops; and the popular discontent soon found vent in libels on the stage and elsewhere. But James said that he could not lead a sedentary life and must study his health above all things.[1]

During both reigns the normal tenor of Court life was naturally disturbed from time to time by some exceptional event. Parliaments required to be opened in state, although neither Sovereign was fond of summoning Parliaments.[2] The thanksgiving for the Armada on 24 November 1588 was a notable day of triumph for Elizabeth. James did not win battles, but he created his son Prince of Wales in 1610 and married his daughter in 1613 with considerable pomp. In 1607, being in need of a loan, he fluttered city life by dining with the Lord Mayor on 12 June and the Merchant Taylors on 16 July.[3] The arrival of extraordinary ambassadors or other foreign visitors of importance necessitated frequent provision for their entertainment. The constant relations which Elizabeth maintained with France led to a number of special missions, for one purpose or another, diplomatic or complimentary, throughout the reign. The most interesting of these, from the point of view of an annalist of Court revels, were concerned with the negotiations, already referred to, for a marriage with the Duke of Alençon, afterwards Duke of Anjou and 'Monsieur' of France, the brother of Henri III. These began in 1578 and came to a head in 1581, when a visit by Francis de Bourbon, Dauphin de Montpensier, and other commissioners in the spring was followed by another by Anjou himself in November, which lasted over Christmas to the following February. Both occasions were honoured with sumptuous tilts and other entertainments. Before and

[1] *S. P. D.* xii. 13; *V. P.* x. 81, 90, 95, 195, 218; xi. 276; xii. 41, 381; Lodge, iii. 41, 108, 110, 141; Sully, 455, 458; Boderie, i. 310; Winwood, iii. 182.

[2] *V. P.* vii. 23, describes the ceremony in 1559, and Von Wedel, *2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 260, in 1584.

[3] Cf. ch. iv and App. A. In 1612 the Elector Palatine attended the banquet on Lord Mayor's Day; Henry's illness kept him away.

after Monsieur came in 1572 Francis Duke of Montmorency and Marshal of France, in 1601 Marshal Biron, and in 1602 the Duke of Nevers. Biron appears to have been a substitute for his master, Henri IV, whom Elizabeth would have welcomed, but who apparently could not bring himself to face the perils of the Channel crossing. Chapman puts the comment in the Queen's mouth:

> We had not thought that he whose virtues fly
> So beyond-wonder and the reach of thought,
> Should check at eight hours' sail, and his high spirit,
> That stoops to fear less than the poles of heaven,
> Should doubt an under-billow of the sea,
> And, being a sea, be sparing of his streams.[1]

Of visitors from other lands than France may be noted Cecilia, Margravine of Baden and sister of the King of Sweden, in 1565, Feother Pissenopscoia, an ambassador in search of a bride for Ivan I, Tsar of Muscovy, in 1583, and Ludovic Verreyken, ambassador from the archiducal court of Flanders in 1600. Visits were expected from Mary of Scots in 1562 and from James in 1590, but in fact Mary never came until she was a fugitive or James until he was King.[2] Elizabeth, however, on her side, sent complimentary embassies for the intended wedding of James in 1589, and the baptism of his son Henry in 1594. The most important visitor to James himself was the Queen's brother, Christian, King of Denmark, who came twice. His elaborate state visit in July and August 1606 left several unpleasant memories behind it. The Kings fell out over James's indifference to Christian's sister. Hunting bored Christian and James disliked being outshone by his brother-in-law in running at the ring. Nor did the subjects more readily mix, for the Danes thought the English haughty, and the English thought the Danes gross; and in particular the heavy drinking habits of the north, although by no means uncongenial to James personally, led to scenes which were scandalous in the eyes

[1] *Conspiracy of Byron*, iv. 25. An undated letter from Elizabeth to Henri regrets that in spite of 'nostre sejour en deux lieux si proches l'un de l'autre . . . nous sommes tous deux empeschez de passer la mer'; she adds, 'je me resoudray dans peu de jours de m'en retourner à Londres' (Sully, 364; Berger de Xivrey, *Lettres missives de Henri IV*, v. 464). This was doubtless written early in Sept. 1601 when Elizabeth was at Basing and Henri at Calais. Sully, followed by Strickland, 678, has an elaborate account of the business, including an interview between himself and Elizabeth at Dover, but the itinerary (cf. App. A) makes it impossible that she can have gone to Dover.

[2] *V. P.* viii. 496; cf. ch. v.

of all who remembered the austerer fashions of Elizabeth.[1] It was a general relief when Christian decided to abridge the period originally set down for his stay. He came again, briefly and informally, in 1614. Other Jacobean visitors were the Duke of Holstein, another brother of the Queen, in 1604, the Prince de Joinville in 1607, the Prince of Brunswick, a nephew of the Queen, in 1610, the Duc de Bouillon in 1612, and the Elector Palatine, for his wedding with the Princess Elizabeth, in the same year. James received congratulations on his accession from ambassadors extraordinary sent by the Emperor and the Kings of France and Spain, as well as from other representatives of minor powers. Subsequently Juan de Velasco, Constable of Castile, came as ambassador extraordinary from Spain, with other Spanish and Flemish commissioners, for the signing of a treaty of peace in 1604, and had the honour of being waited upon by Shakespeare as groom of the chamber.[2]

In addition to extraordinary ambassadors there were generally also permanent or ' lieger ' ambassadors in residence. These varied in number with the shifting diplomacies of the time. France was the foreign country most constantly represented at Elizabeth's Court.[3] There was generally also a Scottish ambassador. Diplomatic relations with Spain were broken off in 1584 ;[4] and there were no Italian ambassadors,

[1] Cf. ch. v for Harington's description of a drunken mask at Theobalds ; there is confirmatory evidence in *V. P.* x. 386 ; Boderie, i. 241, 283, 297.

[2] Cf. ch. xiii, s.v. King's.

[3] Gilles de Noailles, Abbé de Lisle (1559), Michel de Seurre (1560–2), Paul de Foix (1562–6), Jacques Bochetel, Sieur de la Forest (1566–8), Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon (1568–75), Michel de Castelnau, Sieur de Mauvissière (1575–85), Guillaume de L'Aubespine, Baron de Chasteauneuf (1585–9), Le Sieur de Beauvoir (de La Nocte) (1589–98 ?), Le Sieur Thumery de Boissise (1598–1601), Christophe de Harlay, Comte de Beaumont (1601–5), Antoine Le Fèvre, Sieur de la Boderie (1606–11), Samuel Spifame, Sieur des Bisseaux (1611–15), Gaspard Dauvet, Sieur des Marets (1615–18). Complete lists of lieger and extraordinary ambassadors, with notes of the manuscripts containing their dispatches, are given by A. Baschet in *Reports of Deputy Keeper of the Records*, xxxvii, App. I, 188 ; xxxix, App. 573 ; and C. H. Firth and S. C. Lomax, *Notes on the Diplomatic Relations of England and France*, 1603–88 (1906) ; cf. *General Bibl. Note*, s.v. Beaumont, Boissise, La Boderie, La Mothe.

[4] The Spanish ambassadors during 1558–84 were Don Gomez Suarez de Figueroa, Count of Féria (Jan. 1558–May 1559), Don Alvaro de la Quadra, Bishop of Aquila (May 1559–Aug. 1563), Don Diego Guzman de Silva (Jan. 1564–Sept. 1568), Don Guerau de Spes (Sept. 1568–Dec. 1571), Don Bernardino de Mendoza (March 1578–Jan. 1584) ; their dispatches are in *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España*, lxxxvii, lxxxix–xcii, and are calendared, with those of Antonio de Guaras, a merchant who acted as agent 1573–7, in M. A. S. Hume, *Calendar of Letters*

in spite of overtures to Venice, until the last few months of the reign, when the Doge and Senate sent over the Secretary Scaramelli.[1] The accession of James and the peace with Spain brought about a considerable change in international relations, and henceforward there were regularly 'lieger' ambassadors from France, Spain, Venice, and Flanders, as well as ambassadors or agents from the Dutch states, Savoy and Florence. For the entertainment of these an occasional dinner or supper with the King sufficed, together with invitations to such cerẽmonies of state, revels, and tilts as were held in ordinary course. But the revels were perturbed and an infinity of trouble given to the officials who organized them by the persistent jealousies and disputes for precedence which prevailed amongst the diplomatic representatives themselves. The records of these intrigues, which especially centred round the great Court masks, and often determined the dates on which they were held, occupy much space in the dispatches sent home to Paris and to Venice, and furnished Sir John Finet in 1656 with material for the curious pages of his *Philoxenis*. The rival claims of the 'Catholic' King of France and the 'most Christian' King of Spain to be regarded as the first Sovereign in Christendom had already caused

and State Papers relating to English Affairs, preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas (1892–9, cited as *Sp. P.*). The ambassadors 1603–16 were Don Juan de Taxis, Count of Villa Mediana (Aug. 1603–July 1605), Don Juan Fernandez de Velasco, Duke of Frias and Constable of Castile, and Alessandro Rovida, Senator of Milan (extraordinary as commissioners, with John de Ligne, Prince of Brabançon and Count of Aremberg, Juan Richardot, Councillor of State, and Ludovic Verreyken, Audiencier, representing the Archduke Albert and Archduchess Isabella of Flanders, for the treaty of Aug. 1604), Don Pedro de Zuniga (July 1605–May 1610), Don Fernando de Giron (extraordinary, 1608–9), Don Alonzo de Velasco (May 1610–Aug. 1613), Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, afterwards Conde de Gondomar (Aug. 1613). Their dispatches are not in print, but a *Relacion de la Jornada del Exc^mo Condestable de Castilla* is in the *Colección de Documentos Inéditos*, lxxi. 467.

[1] The Venetian ambassadors were Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli (Secretary, Feb.–Nov. 1603), Pietro Duodo (extraordinary, 1603), Nicolò Molin (Nov. 1603–Dec. 1605), Giorgio Giustinian (Dec. 1605–Oct. 1608), Marc' Antonio Correr (Oct. 1608–Apr. 1611), Francesco Contarini (extraordinary, 1610), Antonio Foscarini (Apr. 1611–Dec. 1615), Gregorio Barbarigo (Sept. 1615–May 1616). Reports of the state of England by Molin, Contarini, and Correr are in N. Barozzi e Guglielmo Berchet, *Le Relazioni degli Stati Europei . . . nel secolo decimosettimo*, iv (1863). The current dispatches are calendared in *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs . . . in Venice and . . . Northern Italy* (cited as *V. P.*). A report to the Senate by Zuanne Falier and others who visited England privately in 1575 states that they were advised by a Bolognese groom of the privy chamber, favoured by Elizabeth as an excellent musician [? Alfonso Ferrabosco], to suggest the desirability of an embassy (*V. P.*

trouble as far back as 1564.[1] The question had naturally been in abeyance during the rupture with Spain. Under James it broke out again, and each ambassador had the strictest order from his government not to abate a jot or tittle of his full claims to precedence. James, being *rex pacificus*, had no desire to commit himself to a decision on so knotty a point, and did his best to evade it, by not inviting both ambassadors to the same festivity. But even then one festivity differed from another in glory, and the attempt to keep an even balance gave rise to endless *tracasseries*. During the earlier years it seems clear that a variety of causes, amongst which must be counted his own superior astuteness, a liberal distribution of bribes, the Spanish proclivities of Anne, and probably also the deliberate trend of James's foreign policy, enabled Juan de Taxis to snatch more than one advantage from his French rivals. He secured an invitation to the Queen's mask both in 1604 and 1605. This double rebuff led to a change in the French embassy, and a similar success of De Taxis in 1608 so infuriated Henri IV that he threatened to withdraw his ambassador altogether, until James judged it discreet to call his attention to the still unpaid financial obligations which he had incurred to the English Crown in the previous reign. After the death of Henri in 1610 and the consequent *rapprochement* between France and Spain, the balance of political forces shifted, and, for a time at least, the English Court laid itself out to gratify rather than humiliate the French. Minor bones of precedence were worried between Venice and Flanders, and between Florence and Savoy, while the Spanish ambassador took offence if he was asked to appear in public with the representative of the revolted Spanish provinces of the Netherlands.[2]

vii. 524). Retiring Venetian ambassadors were sometimes knighted and given a lion of England to quarter on their shields (*V. P.* xii. 163; xiv. 85).

[1] *Sp. P.* i. 382, 385, 403, 451, 545.

[2] *S. P. D., Jac. I*, vi. 21; xii. 16; Winwood, iii. 155; P. L. de Kermaingant, *Mission de Christophe de Harlay*, 173, 252; De la Boderie, *Ambassades*, i. 240, 262, 271, 277, 291, 353; iii. 1–192 *passim*; *V. P.* x. 139, 149, 212, 234, 388, 408; xi. 83, 86, 212. I have given some details in relation to the masks in ch. xxiii; cf. also ch. vi. There is a connected narrative of the Franco-Spanish disputes in M. Sullivan, *Court Masques of James I*, which perhaps lays insufficient stress on incidents occurring at state ceremonies and tilts as distinct from masks.

II

THE ROYAL HOUSEHOLD

[*Bibliographical Note.*—There is no systematic history of the household, but the growing tendency, notable in such recent works as those of Professor Baldwin and Professor Tout, to dwell on the administrative, as distinct from the 'constitutional', aspect of politics suggests that the gap may some day be filled. A useful short study is R. H. Gretton, *The King's Government* (1913). Of the numerous books bearing more or less directly on the subject, I give here mainly those which I have found of practical value in writing this chapter. Professor Tout's *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, of which the first two volumes have subsequently (1920) appeared, is of course of fundamental importance. The best worked section is that of mediaeval origins. The general surveys of W. Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development* (1880), and W. R. Anson, *The Law and Custom of the Constitution* (1886–92), may be supplemented for the earliest period by L. M. Larson, *The King's Household in England before the Norman Conquest* (1904); for the eleventh to thirteenth centuries by H. W. C. Davis, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, i (1913), T. Madox, *History and Antiquities of the Exchequer* (1769), R. L. Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century* (1912), J. H. Round, *The King's Serjeants and Officers of State* (1911), and L. W. Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward and the Trial of Peers* (1907); for the fourteenth century by T. F. Tout, *The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History* (1914), J. C. Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (1918), F. J. Furnivall and R. E. G. Kirk, *Life Records of Chaucer* (1875–1900), and J. R. Hulbert, *Chaucer's Official Life* (1912); for the fifteenth century by C. Plummer, *Sir John Fortescue's Governance of England* (1885), and by the 'courtesy books' or treatises on domestic service and etiquette in F. J. Furnivall, *The Babees Book*, &c. (1868, *E. E. T. S.*), *Queen Elizabeth's Achademy*, &c. (1869, *E. E. T. S.*), and R. W. Chambers, *A Fifteenth-Century Courtesy Book* (1914, *E. E. T. S.*); for the Privy Council by N. H. Nicolas, *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council* (1834–7), J. R. Dasent, *Acts of the Privy Council* (1890–1907), A. V. Dicey, *The Privy Council* (1887), J. F. Baldwin, *The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages* (1913), T. F. T. Plucknett, *The Place of the Council in the Fifteenth Century* (1918, *4 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* i. 157), E. Percy, *The Privy Council under the Tudors* (1907), and C. Hornemann, *Das Privy Council von England zur Zeit der Königin Elisabeth* (1912); and for the Star Chamber, W. P. Baildon's edition of John Hawarde's *Reportes del Cases in Camera Stellata* (1894), and C. Scofield, *The Court of Star Chamber* (1900). Some of the above extend to the sixteenth century; but in the main the Tudor-Stuart period has received less attention than it deserves. Even the lists of the great officers, as given in the ordinary books of reference, are generally incorrect. The most valuable summary is the quite recent one of E. P. Cheyney, *History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth*, i (1914). Samuel Pegge set out to write an account of the Hospitium Regis and published four sections, on the Esquires of the Body, the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber, the Gentlemen Pensioners, and the Yeomen of the Guard

as a first volume of *Curialia ; or an Historical Account of the Royal Household* (1791). From the material left at his death, J. Nichols published two more, on Somerset House and the Serjeants at Arms, in a second volume of *Curialia* (1806), and some fragments in *Curialia Miscellanea* (1818). Other special studies are F. S. Thomas, *Notes of Materials for the History of Public Departments* (1846), and *The Ancient Exchequer of England* (1848), N. Carlisle, *An Inquiry into the Place and Quality of the Gentlemen of his Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Chamber* (1829), E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Lords Chamberlain* (1907, *Malone Soc. Collections*, i. 31), W. Nagel, *Annalen der Englischen Hofmusik* (1894, *Beilage zu den Monatsheften für Musikgeschichte*, 26), H. C. De Lafontaine, *The King's Musick* (1909), *Lists of the King's Musicians* (*Musical Antiquary*, i–iv, *passim*). A. P. Newton's valuable paper on *The King's Chamber under the Early Tudors* (1917, *E. H. R.* xxxii. 348) appeared after my paragraphs on the Treasurer of the Chamber were written, but has helped me to revise them. An account of the post-Restoration household is given in J. Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitiae, or The Present State of England* (1669), which became an annual ; and this, with the works of Pegge and Carlisle, were drawn upon for the historical part of W. J. Thoms, *The Book of Court* (1838). The modern household is the subject of W. A. Lindsay, *The Royal Household* (1898). A summary, useful for comparison, of the sixteenth-century French household, is in L. Batiffol, *The Century of the Renaissance* (1916, tr.), 92.

There is, of course, ample material for the historian of the Tudor-Stuart Household when he presents himself. The personal references of annalists, diplomatists, and letter-writers (cf. *Bibl. Note* to ch. i) help out the more formal documents preserved in large numbers in the Record Office (cf. S. R. Scargill-Bird, *Guide to Various Classes of Documents in the Public Record Office*[3], 1908) and the British Museum (cf. sections on *Public Revenue and State Establishments* in *Classified Catalogue of Manuscripts*), of which a few have been printed in *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household* (*Society of Antiquaries*, 1790, cited as *H. O.*), in J. Nichols, *Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*[2] (1823), and *Progresses, Processions, and Festivities of James I* (1828), and elsewhere. The Record Office, in addition to many records, such as those of the Auditors of Prests (cf. App. B), which relate to the Household, contains the special archives of the Lord Chamberlain's Department and the Lord Steward's Department themselves ; both, however, are very fragmentary. The earlier documents of the Lord Chamberlain's Department mainly relate to the Wardrobe. The Warrant books only begin about the reign of Charles I ; a selection of entries bearing upon the stage is given by C. C. Stopes in *Jahrbuch*, xlvi. 92. The papers in the British Museum are partly official records which have strayed from their proper custody, partly the collections of antiquaries, and partly the administrative memoranda of ministers such as Lord Burghley, Lord Salisbury, and Sir Julius Caesar. Similar collections in private hands are calendared in the reports of the *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, and in particular in the *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury* (1883–1915, cited as *Cecil MSS.* or *Hatfield MSS.*). The most important documents for tracing the history of the household consist (*a*) of account-books, (*b*) of royal ordinances and of ceremonials either for the household as a whole or for some branch of it, to the more comprehensive of which are sometimes attached schedules of offices with the fees and other allowances belonging to them, and (*c*) lists of the actual occupants of offices drawn up from time to time for various administrative purposes. The most complete lists seem to be those of officers receiving liveries at

coronations and funerals. These are appended to the special *Accounts* of the Masters of the Wardrobe for such ceremonies, and copies, covering *inter alia* the coronation (1559) and funeral (1603) of Elizabeth, the coronation (1604) and funeral (1625) of James, the funeral (1612) of Henry, and the funeral (1619) of Anne, are preserved as precedents in *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, ii. 4–6. On the other hand, it is necessary to exercise caution in using the very numerous lists which bear some such title as ' A Generall Collection of all the Offices in England with their Fees in her Maiesties Gift '. Of these I have noted the following: *Stowe MS.* 571, f. 6 (1552); *Harl. MS.* 240 (1545–53); *Stowe MS.* 571, f. 133 (1575–80); *Stowe MS.* 571, f. 159 (1587–90); *Lansd. MS.* 171, f. 246^{v} (1587–91); *Cotton MS., Titus* B iii, f. 163^{v} (1585–93); *S. P. D., Eliz.* ccxxi (1588–93); *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, v. 33 (1593); *Hargrave MS.* 215 (1592–5); *Stowe MS.* 572, f. 26 (1592–6); *Harl. MS.* 2078, f. 6 (1592–6); *H. O.* 241 (misdated 1578) from Peck, i. 51 (1598); *Addl. MS.* 35848 (1605–7); *Addl. MS.* 38008 (1605–7); *Archaeologia*, xv. 72 (1606); *Stowe MS.* 574 (*temp.* Jac. I); *Stowe MS.* 575 (1616). The dates are mostly approximate, rendered possible by the fact that the occupants of a few of the chief posts are usually named. The list of 1552 alone has all the names and is in the full sense an Establishment List. The rest should probably be regarded not as official lists but as convenient handbooks prepared for courtiers seeking patronage. Errors of transcription are frequent, and often recur in several manuscripts. *Stowe MS.* 574 is interesting, because a second hand has corrected several errors. It seems pretty clear that the names of offices were sometimes retained on these lists after the offices were in fact obsolete. They are not limited to Household Offices, but are usually arranged in four sections, Courts of Justice, Household (1, Household proper, 2, Standing offices; cf. p. 49), Military Posts, Keeperships (cf. p. 11). They include fees payable in the household, as well as at the Exchequer; and have prototypes, in less fixed form, in lists *temp.* Hen. VIII (Brewer, ii. 873; iii. 364; iv. 868). A more careful list, of somewhat similar type, with names appended, but limited to fees payable at the Exchequer, is to be found in the abstract of revenue and expenditure in 1617 printed with the pamphlet *Truth Brought to Light and Discovered by Time* (1651, cited as *Abstract*).

But there are no comprehensive ordinances for the Tudor-Stuart Household, which must largely be studied from its origins. The best text of the *Constitutio Domus Regis* of Henry I (*c.* 1135) is in T. Hearne, *Liber Niger Scaccarii*[2] (1774), i. 341; a less good one in H. Hall, *The Red Book of the Exchequer* (1896, Rolls Series), iii. 807. For Edward I we have unprinted ordinances of 1279 (*Addl. MS.* 4565 H; *Lord Steward's Misc.* 298), and the description of the palace jurisdictions by a contemporary lawyer (*c.* 1290) in John Selden's edition of *Fleta, seu Commentarius Juris Anglicani* (1685); for Edward II ordinances of 1318 and 1323 edited from the French original in Tout, 267, and from a translation by Francis Tate (1601) in *Life Records of Chaucer*, ii. 1, together with related Exchequer ordinances in Hall, iii. 908, 930. Ordinances of Edward III, not known to be extant, are referred to by the compiler of the *Liber Niger Domus Regis Angliae* in the reign of Edward IV. Of the *Liber Niger* a large number of manuscripts exist (*Lord Steward's Misc.* 299; *Exchequer T. of R. Misc.* 230; *Harl. MSS.* 293, f. 19; 298, f. 41; 369, f. 56^{v}; 610, f. 1; 642, f. 196^{v}; *Soc. Antiq. MS.*). It is not certain from which of these the bad text in *H. O.* 13 is printed; probably it used the last two. The *Liber Niger* is less an ordinance than an unfinished literary treatise by a household clerk, probably motived by the actual ordinances of 1478, of which an unprinted copy is in *Exchequer T. of R. Misc.* 206. An

ordinance of Henry VII (1493) and a ceremonial of the same reign are in *H. O.* 107. The documents of Henry VIII's time are complicated. There appear to be three sets of ordinances: (*a*) the Eltham Articles drawn up by Wolsey (Halle, ii. 56) in Jan. 1526 (*Lord Steward's Misc.* 299, ff. 158, 163; *Exchequer T. of R. Misc.* 231; *H. O.* 137–61, from *Harl. MS.* 642); (*b*) ordinances related to a 'new book of household', *c.* 1540 (*H. O.* 228–40); (*c*) scattered ordinances, *c.* 1532–44 (*H. O.* 208–27). Subsidiary lists and documents of about the period of (*a*) are in *Lord Steward's Misc.* 299, and, perhaps with some of other dates, in Brewer, IV. i. 860. Those printed from a *Dunch MS.* in *Genealogist*, xxix, xxx, appear to belong to the 'new book' of (*b*). A third set, of *c.* 1544–6, are in *H. O.* 165–207. Much other material is scattered through the twenty-one volumes of the *Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* (1862–1910, cited as Brewer), including some of earlier date than the Eltham Articles.—I need hardly add that for the purposes of this chapter I have rarely been able to go beyond printed sources.]

The ordering of court life and ceremonial was in the hands of a group of departments which made up the somewhat complicated establishment of the royal Household. But the Household, at a time when the personal capacity of the Crown was as yet imperfectly differentiated from its national capacity, was not merely a domestic organization; it was still to a large extent an instrument of central executive government. It must in fact be regarded as the direct descendant of the eleventh-century *curia regis*, through which all the important functions, deliberative, judicial, financial, and administrative, had been carried out. The *curia* had consisted partly of the territorial magnates, earls, and barons, who had been, or whose fathers had been, the King's *comitatus* in battle; partly of knights still in attendance upon the King's person, and hoping some day, in reward for their services, to become territorial magnates in turn; partly, and to an increasing extent as government became more complicated and difficult, of clerks whose trained skill with the pen and with figures made them more practically useful than the lay knights in all those branches of affairs which entailed book-keeping and correspondence. All the members of the *curia*, in smaller or greater numbers, according to the magnitude of the business to be transacted and the willingness of the lords to leave their estates, sat with the King from time to time, and advised him as his *consilium*; but except on great occasions of state it was left to the knights to wait at his table and order his servants about, and to the clerks to write and send his letters, and to act as his assessors or his deputies in the exercise of justice or the collection and spending of his revenue. In course of time some of the functions of the original *curia* had become specialized in distinct departments, which acquired a permanent habi-

tation at Westminster, ceased to follow the King's wanderings, and were no longer regarded as part of the personal Household. Thus the *curia* as a judicial body became the Courts of Law; the *curia* as a financial body became the Exchequer; while at a somewhat later date the Chancery undertook the double function of issuing royal grants and other formal correspondence of the Crown, and of supplementing the Courts of Law by exercising an equitable jurisdiction in cases which ordinary law was inadequate to cover. To the central *curia* or Household, still composed of lay and clerical officers lodged in the King's palace and eating in his hall, wherever that might happen to be, three things were left. It ministered to the material well-being and splendour of the Sovereign himself; it exercised under his personal direction such functions of administration, for example the control of foreign policy and war, as had not passed to the specialized departments; and, perhaps most important of all, it remained potentially able to resume at his will the exercise of functions precisely analogous to those which had so passed. This paradox of the duplicate exercise of royal functions, through the specialized departments and through the Household, lies at the bottom of an understanding of mediaeval government.

The differentiation of the Courts of Law, the Exchequer, and the Chancery from the Household was complete by the thirteenth century; but the same tendency towards the budding off of quasi-independent departments of state from the administrative nucleus continued to manifest itself in a minor degree up to and even, for all their centralizing instinct, within the period of the Tudors. Moreover, as the scale of the Household became larger and its individual ministers began to require assistance, there grew up a corresponding tendency towards the formation of separate offices within the nucleus itself. The staffing of these offices with servants of various grades, their responsibilities and interrelations, and the control of them through the chief officers of the Household, were determined by royal ordinances, which go into minute detail, and reveal a complex organization, based upon long-standing tradition, and at the same time flexible in its capacity of adaptation to shifting circumstances. The main structure of the Household, as we find it under Elizabeth, appears to have been already fixed in the time of Edward IV and even in that of Edward II, although minor changes had been introduced, largely through Tudor imitation of the French *hôtel du roi*, just as there had been minor changes under Richard II and his Lancastrian successors,

some of which are noted to our advantage by a clerk of literary tastes, who about 1478 bethought him to compile in the so-called *Liber Niger* a systematic account or *rationale* of the establishment in which doubtless he played a part. And the beginnings of the same structure can be traced back farther still, through ordinances of Edward I in 1279 to the *Constitutio Domus Regis* as it stood at the end of Henry I's reign in 1135, and even perhaps, so far as the principal officers are concerned, to the Normanized Anglo-Saxon Court of pre-Conquest days. And after Elizabeth's reign the structure lasted, again with modifications of detail, for nearly two centuries more, until it was somewhat severely overhauled, in a moment of reforming zeal, by what is known as Burke's Act of 1782.[1] This conservatism of structure may perhaps justify us in finding an explanation of the tripartite character which the organization of the Household at every stage displays, as arising naturally out of the local arrangement of a primitive royal habitation. The palace stood in a court-yard, and it consisted essentially of a hall where the King feasted and took counsel with his *comitatus*, and of a chamber where he retired to sleep and to be private, and where he probably kept his treasure-chest. The duties of his personal servants fell either in the court-yard or in the hall or in the chamber. In the court-yard the *constabularii* drilled the royal body-guard and the *marescalli* looked after the horses; in the hall the *dapiferi* and the *pincernae* ministered food and drink; in the chamber the *camerarii* or *cubicularii*, aided as time went on by the *clerici*, watched the King's treasure and his bed, and stood ready to receive and transmit his personal mandates. Originally, it would seem, there were several officers of each class. Afterwards they were reduced to one, or one was chosen as *magister* over the rest; whatever the process, a single chief officer, with a group of subordinates beneath him, emerges as representative of each of the three departments. Perhaps the change was assisted by the demand of the barons, jealous of the rise in their absence of new men at Court, to have Household posts conferred upon them as part of their hereditaments. By the middle of the twelfth century there were already a hereditary Great Chamberlain, a High Steward, a High Constable, a Chief Butler, and an Earl Marshal.[2] But,

[1] *22 George III*, c. 82.

[2] Stubbs, i. 382; Round, 68, 76, 82, 112, 140; Tout, 67. By Elizabeth's accession the High Stewardship and High Constableship had reverted to the Crown, and the offices were only temporarily conferred for occasions of state. The Great Chamberlainship was *de iure* in the same position, but was accepted under a misunderstanding as hereditary in the house

obviously, if the King was in the habit of appointing two chamberlains or two stewards, he could make one of each pair hereditary, and still have another at his own appointment. And he could call on the hereditary officer to officiate on state occasions and the appointed officer to officiate in daily life. The hereditary man would have the greater dignity and the appointed man the greater power. This, rather than deputation by the hereditary officers, seems to be the explanation of the existence of a Chamberlain of the Household side by side with the Lord Great Chamberlain and of a Steward of the Household side by side with the Lord High Steward. It is really only another example of the duplication of functions, through officers of state on the one hand, and Household officers on the other, to which attention has already been called; with the added feature that in this case the officers of state seem to have had sinecures from the beginning.

The tripartite organization is traceable clearly enough in the Household of Elizabeth, as in that of her predecessors. There was, of course, a close co-operation at many points between the different departments; and, indeed, the simplicity of the original scheme had inevitably been interfered with, as the sovereigns began more and more to retire from their hall and to subdivide their chamber in order to adapt it to the complicated needs of an increasingly luxurious private life. The department of the court-yard, moreover, would appear, long before Elizabeth's time, to have shed many of what must be supposed to have been its original functions. The hereditary Lord High Constable had left no *constabularius* behind him at court, and although the Earl Marshal, also hereditary, continued to exercise certain functions, such as an oversight over the heralds, he was in no sense the head of a Household department. The Knight Marshal, who exercised a jurisdiction over breaches of peace within the verge (*virgata*) of twelve leagues round the court, was nominally at least his deputy, but the only other marshals

of De Vere, Earls of Oxford. The Chief Butlership was hereditary in the house of Fitzalan, Earls of Arundel, and the Earl Marshalship in that of Howard, Dukes of Norfolk. It reverted on the attainder of Thomas 4th Duke in 1572. On 28 Dec. 1597 it was conferred on Robert Earl of Essex, and after his execution on 25 Feb. 1601 was placed in commission. These great offices, granted as hereditaments, are to be distinguished from serjeanties, or grants of land *per servientiam* to the holders of minor household posts, which thus became hereditary. Grants of serjeanties ceased early in the thirteenth century, and the only household duties exercised by their holders in the sixteenth century were formal ones on special occasions.

in the Household were officers of the Hall. Similarly the oversight of the guard seems to have passed to the Chamberlain. Nor had the Marshal any longer the responsibility for the stable which the etymology of his name suggests.[1] The Stable was, indeed, still a distinct department, but its head was the Master of the Horse, who, although he ranked as one of the three chief officers of the Household, was of comparatively recent origin.[2]

By a somewhat troublesome variation in the use of terms, the Lord Steward's department is sometimes called the 'Household' in a very narrow sense, which excludes the Chamber and the Stable. The author of the *Liber Niger* distinguishes it as the *domus providentiae* from the Chamber as the *domus magnificentiae*.[3] Roughly speaking, it concerned itself with the material necessities, the food and drink, the lighting and the fuel, of the Sovereign and his court, while all else that ministered to his personal life and the dignity of his state, his lodging and his apparel, his entertainments, his study and his recreations, fell within the sphere of the Chamber. Its original nucleus was still represented under Elizabeth by the officers of the Hall, Marshals, Sewers, and Surveyors; but the Hall had shrunk in importance since the Sovereign had ceased to dine in it, and some of these posts had long been duplicated within the Chamber itself, and even there were tending to become honorific rather than effective.[4] The real functions of the department were now

[1] The derivation is through the French from O.H.G. *marascalh* (*marah*, horse; *scalh*, servant). Round, 84, traces an early connexion of the marshal with the stable.

[2] A Squire of the Body held the office of Master of the Horse in 1480 (Nicolas, *Wardrobe Accts. of Ed. IV*). The term 'Master', generally applied to heads of offices in the outer ring of the Household, does not seem to be of very early origin. It probably replaces the fourteenth-century 'Serjeant'. Sir Thomas Cawarden got a 'Mastership' of the Revels in 1544, as he 'did mislyke to be tearmed a Seriaunt because of his better countenaunce of roome and place beinge of the kinges maiesties privye Chamber' (*Tudor Revels*, 2). The Mastership of the Horse was held by Lord Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester (11 Jan. 1559–87), Robert Earl of Essex (23 Dec. 1587–25 Feb. 1601), Edward Somerset, 4th Earl of Worcester (deputy Dec. 1597; Master 21 Apr. 1601–2 Jan. 1616), Sir George Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham (3 Jan. 1616). The appointment, like that of other 'Masters', but unlike that of the Chamberlain and Steward, was by patent and carried a fee of 1,000 marks (£666 13*s.* 4*d.*). Amongst the lesser Stable officers were the royal Footmen, whom we might expect to find in the Chamber.

[3] *H. O.* 19, 55.

[4] For the functions of Hall officers, as understood in the fifteenth century, cf. the 'courtesy' books, especially J. Russell's *Boke of Nurture*, the anonymous *Boke of Kervynge* and *Boke of Curtesye* (Furnivall, *Babee's Book*), and R. W. Chambers, *A Fifteenth-Century Courtesy Book*.

exercised in the subsidiary offices of provision, which had grown up round the Hall. Of these there were twenty, each under a Serjeant or other head with an appropriate staff of clerks, yeomen, grooms, pages, and children. They were the Kitchen, the Bake-house, the Pantry, the Cellar, the Buttery, the Pitcher-house, the Spicery, the Chandlery, the Wafery, the Confectionery, the Ewery, the Laundry, the Larder, the Boiling-house, the Accatry, the Poultry, the Scalding-house, the Pastry, the Scullery, and the Woodyard. The department also included the Almonry under a Lord High Almoner, who was an ecclesiastic, and the Porters. Administrative control was exercised by the Board of Green Cloth, consisting of the Treasurer and Comptroller of the Household, and the Cofferer or household cashier.[1] These had the assistance of a staff of clerks and clerk comptrollers, known as the Counting House. Above all was the chief officer of the department, the Lord Steward of the Household. The Steward, whose name seems to be an exact equivalent for both the Latin terms *dapifer* and *Senescallus*, is not likely to have had in the beginning any priority over the *camerarius*; but historical reasons had brought him to the forefront towards the end of the thirteenth century, and thereafter he continued to rank as first officer of the Household. Henry VIII, following a French analogy, had renamed him Grand Master of the Household, but the new term had not permanently succeeded in establishing itself. Under Elizabeth the post was sometimes left vacant. But it was always filled during the session of a Parliament, for it was the ancient custom for the lords of Parliament to dine at the Lord Steward's table in the court.[2] In the absence

[1] The Treasurers of the Household were Sir Thomas Cheyne (1558–9), Sir Thomas Parry (1559–70), Sir Francis Knollys (1570–96), Roger Lord North (1596–1600), Sir William Knollys, afterwards Lord Knollys (1602–16); the Comptrollers, Sir Thomas Parry (1558–9), Sir Edward Rogers (1559–67), Sir James Croft (1570–90), Sir William Knollys (1596–1602), Sir Edward Wotton, afterwards Lord Wotton (1602–16); cf. *D. N. B.*, *passim* (with some errors); Dasent, vii. 3, 43; *V. P.* vii. 1; *Sp. P.* ii. 227; Wright, i. 355; *Sadleir Papers*, ii. 368; *Carew Correspondence* (C.S.), 152.

[2] The Lords Steward were Henry Earl of Arundel (1558–64), William Earl of Pembroke (1567–70), Edward Earl of Lincoln (1581–4), Robert Earl of Leicester (1585–8), Henry Earl of Derby (1588–93), Charles Earl of Nottingham (1597–1615), Ludovick Duke of Lennox and afterwards Richmond (1615–24); cf. Dasent, xxviii. 60, 107; *S. P. D. Eliz.* clxxiii. 94; Stowe, 664; *Sc. P.* ix. 611; *Sp. P.* i. 18, 368, 631; ii. 239, 455; iv. 122; *V. P.* vii. 3; *Hatfield MSS.* i. 452; xi. 478; *Sydney Papers*, ii. 75, 77; Hawarde, 84; Camden (trans.), 124, 226, 373, and *James*, 14; La Mothe Fénelon, ii. 332; iv. 437; v. 60; Goodman, i. 178, 191; Cheyney, 28; *Lords Journals*, i. 543, 581; ii. 21, 62, 64, 116, 146, 169, 192, 227, &c.; Wright, *Arthur Hall*, 194–7.

of a Lord Steward, the department was managed, under some general supervision from the Lord Chamberlain, who then became first officer, by the Treasurer and Comptroller, who were important personages with seats on the Privy Council. The original *dapiferi* had had as colleagues the *pincernae*, but the Chief Butlership was now an hereditary sinecure, and the duties were divided between the subordinate office of the Cellar and the Cupbearer, who was an officer of the Chamber.

We come now to the Lord Chamberlain, incomparably the most important figure at court in all matters concerned with entertainments. The *camerarii* and *cubicularii* are discernible before the Conquest, and the corresponding Anglo-Saxon terms appear to be *burþegn*, *bedþegn*, and *hræglþegn*. Perhaps the *hrægl* or wardrobe was already becoming separated from the *bur* or bed-chamber.[1] In the days of William Rufus one Herbert was *regis cubicularius et thesaurarius*.[2] This was before the Exchequer under its Lord High Treasurer had branched off as a separate department of state, but the post of Chamberlain of the Exchequer continued for many centuries to testify to the original location of the treasure chest in the *camera*. About 1135 there was a *magister camerarius*, the equal in salary and allowances of the *cancellarius*, the *dapiferi*, the *magister pincerna*, the *thesaurarius*, and the *constabularii*. There were also other *camerarii* of lower degrees taking turns of duty, and a special *camerarius candelae*, ranking lower still.[3] Presumably the *magister camerarius* became the hereditary Lord Great Chamberlain, whose coronation services, which are connected with the charge of the King's bed-chamber, the handing of a basin and towel at the banquet, and the preparation of the royal oblations, afford a sufficient indication of the duties of the court office.[4] And on the retirement of the hereditary officer from court, it seems probable that one of the other *camerarii* advanced to the position of acting *magister*. At any rate, when the treatise known as *Fleta* was compiled about 1290, there was a single *camerarius* with a *sub-minister* and other officers beneath him. Perhaps he was by this time barely the equal of the *senescallus*, to whom he sat as assessor in the court *de placitis*

[1] Larson, 132; J. H. Round, *The Officers of Edward the Confessor* in *E. H. R.* xix. 90.

[2] *Hist. Mon. Abingdon*, ii. 43.

[3] *Constitutio Domus Regis* in H. Hall, *Red Book of Exchequer*, iii. 807; Hearne, *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, i. 352: 'Magister Camerarius par est Dapifero in lib[er]acione . . . Camerarius qui vice sua servit. ii solid. in die . . . Camerarius Candelae, viii^{d} in die . . . Camerarii sine liberacione in domo comedent, si voluerint'; cf. Stubbs, i. 391; Poole, 96; Round, 62.

[4] Round, 112.

Aulae Regis, although he had also an independent jurisdiction over his own officers and those of the Wardrobe, who were exempt from the Steward's court.[1] On the other hand he was, as Robert of Westminster calls him, 'custos capitis regis', and the author of *Fleta* tells us in another connexion that 'in hospitio pro regula habetur, quod quanto propinquior sit quis Regi, tanto dignior'.[2] On the whole it seems probable that, whatever his traditional status may have been, the practical tendency of the extensive political use made by Edward I of the Steward and the clerical officers of the Wardrobe was to throw the Chamberlain into the background.[3] We also learn from *Fleta* that it was the business of the Chamberlain to look after the King's bed and chamber, and that as fees he had his keep in court, fines from ecclesiastic and lay homagers, the disused plenishings of the *camera*, and a share of all gifts and offerings of food made to the King.[4]

[1] *Fleta*, ii. 2: 'Auditis querimoniis iniuriarum in aula regia audire et terminare [Senescallum], assumptis sibi Camerario, hostiario, vel marescallo aulae militibus, vel aliquo illorum, si omnes interesse non possint'; ii. 6: 'Camerarius autem et subminister Camerarii a jurisdictione Senescalli et Marescalli exempti sunt, veluti omnes garderobarii ut in quibusdam; non enim extendit se iurisdictio Senescalli ad modica delicta Camerariorum vel garderobariorum audienda vel terminanda, eo quod ex consuetudine hospitii sunt exempti, dum tamen illi de quibus exigi contigerit curiae coram Senescallo Cameris Regis et Reginae, et garderobae assidue sunt intendentes; sed coram ipsis Thesaurario et Camerario audiantur querimoniae de huiusmodi ministris et subditis suis, et terminabuntur, praesente tamen clerico Regis ad placita aulae deputato; ita quod de finibus et amerciamentis ex huiusmodi placitis provenientibus nihil Regi depereat.'

[2] *Flores Historiarum*, iii. 194; cf. *Fleta*, ii. 16.

[3] Tout, 12, 68, 169. The 'Seneschal' and 'chambirleyne' are on the same footing as regards fees and allowances in the ordinances of 1318 (Tout, 270). They are knights, and may be bannerets.

[4] *Fleta*, ii. 6: 'Debet enim Camerarius decenter disponere pro lecto Regis, et ut Camerae tapetis et banqueriis ornentur, et quod ignes sufficienter fiant in caminis, et providere ne ullus defectus inveniatur quatenus officium suum contigerit'; ii. 7: 'Foeda autem Camerarii sunt haec, parata sibi debent esse quaecunque pro corpore suo sint necessaria; videlicet, cibus, potus, busca, et candela; et de caeteris foedis sic statuitur. Camerarii Domini Regis habeant de caetero ab Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus, Prioribus, et aliis personis Ecclesiasticis, Comitibus, Baronibus, et aliis integram Baroniam tenentibus, rationabilem finem, cum pro Baroniis suis homagium fecerint aut fidelitatem; et si partem teneant Baroniae, tunc rationabilem finem capiant secundum portionem ipsos contingentem. . . . Permissum est etiam quod Camerarius ex antiqua consuetudine habeat omnia vetera banqueria et tapetos, curtinas et lecta Regis, nec non et omnia ornamenta Camerae usitata et derelicta, et de omnibus exeniis Regi factis Cameram ingredientibus, dum tamen de victualibus aliquam portionem.'

After the break-up of the power of the Wardrobe in the earlier part of the fourteenth century, the propinquity of the Chamberlain to the King gave him an increasing political importance, and attempts were made by the barons to secure his appointment in Parliament. Both in that assembly and in the Privy Council he frequently served as the royal mouthpiece, and he became the regular channel through which petitions for the exercise of the royal prerogative of pardon reached the King.[1] But he continued to discharge his domestic responsibilities, which are detailed both in the *Liber Niger* about 1478 and in early Tudor documents.[2] The Tudor change in the relation between the Crown and the nobility is well indicated by the fact that, while in the fourteenth century the Chamberlain had been a banneret or even a simple knight, in Elizabeth's time the office was an object of ambition for earls and barons. But the dual functions, political and domestic, remained unaltered. The 'Lord' Chamberlain, as he was now generally called, was in regular attendance at court, where his power and responsibility were alike considerable.[3] He gave personal attention to the distribution of

[1] Nicolas, *P. C.* vi. ccxix.

[2] *H. O.* 31 (1478): 'A chamberlayn for the King in household, the grete officer sitting in the Kinges chambre. . . . He presenteth, chargeth, and dischargeth all suche persounes as be of the Kinges chaumbre, except all suche officers of household, as ministre for any vytayle for the Kinges mouthe, or for his chambre; for all those take theire charge at the grene cloth in the countynghouse. This is the chief hed of rulers in the Kinges chambre. . . . Item, he hath the punition of all them that are longing to the chaumber for any offence or outrage. . . . The Chaumberlayne taketh his othe and staffe of the King or of his counsayle; he shall at no tyme within this courte be covered in his service. . . . Within the Kinges gates, no man shall harborow or assigne but this chambyrlayn or ussher, or suche under hym of the King's chambre havyng theyr power. This chamberlayn besyly to serche and oversee the King's chambres, and the astate made therein, to be according, first for all the array longing to his proper royall person, for his proper beddes, for his proper boarde at meale tymes, for the diligent doyng in servyng thereof to his honour and pleasure; to assigne kervers, cupbearers, assewers, phisitians, almoners, knyghts, or other wurshypfull astate for the towell, and for the basyn squires of the body to be attendaunt'; 116 (1493): 'In the absence of the chamberlaine, the usher shall have the same power to command in like manner; alsoe, it is right necessarie for the chamberlaine and ushers to have ever in remembrance all the highe festival dayes in the yeare, and all other tymes, what is longing to their office, that they bee not to seeke when neede is; for they shall have many lookers-on. And such thinges as the ushers know not, lett them resort unto the chamberlaine, and aske his advice at all tymes therein; and soe the ushers bee excused, and the chamberlaine to see that hee reveale himselfe at all tymes, that hee may bee beloved and feared of all such as belong to the chamber.'

[3] Goodman, i. 178, speaking of Hunsdon's time: 'The lord chamberlain, there being at that time no lord steward, is the greatest governor in the

lodgings in the palace.[1] He made the arrangements for the progress.[2] He received the ambassadors and others entitled to a royal audience and conducted them into the presence.[3] He was liable to be rated by the Queen if there was not enough plate on the cupboard.[4] He not merely planned the revels but himself kept order in the banqueting-hall. And for this purpose the white staff, which was the symbol of his office, was a practical instrument ready to his hand.[5] The delivery of this white staff to him by the Sovereign constituted his appointment, which was during pleasure; and at its

King's house; he disposeth of all things above stairs, he hath a greater command of the King's guard than the captains hath, he makes all the chaplains, chooseth most of the King's servants, and all the pursuivants; there being then no dean of the King's chapel, he disposeth of all in the chapel.'

[1] Young, *Mary Sidney*, 16, gives from *Sydney Papers*, i. 271, and manuscripts several letters of 1574–8 from Lady Sidney to Lord Chamberlain Sussex about her accommodation at court. Heneage reported to Hatton on 2 Apr. 1585 (Nicolas, *Hatton*, 415) the Queen's anger with the Lord Chamberlain for allowing Raleigh to be put in Hatton's lodging. Lord Hunsdon apologizes to Sir Robert Cecil for his ill lodging in 1594 (*Hatfield MSS.* iv. 504).

[2] Cf. ch. iv.

[3] Cf. App. F. Secretary Walsingham in 1590 refers an applicant for an audience to the Lord Chamberlain, 'who otherwise will conceave, as he doth alreadie, that I seke to drawe those matters from him' (*Hatfield MSS.* iv. 3).

[4] *Sp. P.* ii. 606. The default was at the reception of Alençon's envoys in Aug. 1578. The Calendar makes Sussex 'Lord Steward', but the original (*Documentos Inéditos*, xci. 270) has 'gran Camarero'. In 1582, at the reception of a lord mayor, 'some young gentilman, being more bold than well mannered, did stand upon the carpett of the clothe of estate, and did allmost leane upon the queshions. Her Highnes found fault with my Lord Chamberlayn and M^r^ Vice-Chamberlayn, and with the Gentlemen Ushers, for suffering such disorders' (Fleetwood to Burghley in Wright, ii. 174).

[5] Cf. ch. vi, p. 205, on the misadventure of Jonson and Sir John Roe in 1603; also Jonson's *Irish Mask* (1613), 12, 'Ish it te fashion to beate te imbasheters here, and knoke 'hem o' te heads phit te phoit stick?', and Beaumont and Fletcher, *Maid's Tragedy* (*c.* 1611), I. ii. 44, 'I cannot blame my lord Calianax for going away: would he were here! he would run raging amongst them, and break a dozen wiser heads than his own in the twinkling of an eye'. John Chamberlain says of Comptroller Sir Thomas Edmondes in 1617 (Birch, i. 385), 'They say he doth somewhat too much flourish and fence with his staves, whereof he hath broken two already, not at tilt, but stickling at the plays this Christmas', and Osborne, *James*, 75, of Philip, Earl of Pembroke, that 'he was intolerable choleric and offensive, and did not refrain, whilst he was Chamberlain, to break many wiser heads than his own [*vide supra*]: M^r^. May that translated Lucan having felt the weight of his staff: which had not his office and the place, being the Banqueting-house, protected, I question whether he would ever have struck again'. This was in Feb. 1634 (*Strafford Papers*, i. 207).

determination he delivered it up again. The Lord Steward and the Treasurer and Comptroller of the Household were similarly appointed, and it is a picturesque touch that at the funeral of the Sovereign the Household officers broke their white staves over the bier.[1] Elizabeth's Chamberlains had a fee of £133 6*s*. 8*d*. and a table and other allowances at court; also a livery from the Great Wardrobe of fourteen yards of tawny velvet, which had been converted by 1606 into an additional fee of £16.[2]

Elizabeth's first Lord Chamberlain was her great-uncle, Lord William Howard, a younger son of the second Duke of Norfolk, who had been created Lord Howard of Effingham in 1554.[3] He was appointed by 20 November 1558, and resigned on becoming Lord Privy Seal in July 1572. His successor was Thomas Radcliffe, third Earl of Sussex, who appears to have held office continuously, in spite of occasional absence from his duties, until his death on 9 June 1583. Then came Charles, second Lord Howard of Effingham, for a short period from Christmas 1583 or earlier until his appointment as Lord Admiral about June 1585; and then on 4 July 1585 Elizabeth's first cousin, Henry Carey, first Lord Hunsdon, who established and handed down to his son the famous company of players which included William Shakespeare. Hunsdon was himself a soldier rather than a courtier.[4] He died on 22 July 1596, and the Chamberlainship passed to William Brooke, seventh Lord Cobham. But on 5 March 1597 Cobham himself died, and the office reverted to the house of Hunsdon in the person of George Carey, second lord, who retained it to the end of the reign. By this time he was in ill health, and although he was at first formally continued in his post with the rest of the household, he was replaced on 4 May 1603 by Thomas, Lord Howard of Walden, who on the following 21 July was created Earl of Suffolk. He died on 9 September 1603. Suffolk remained Lord Chamberlain during the palmy days of the Jacobean

[1] Machyn, 183, of Mary's funeral, 'All the offesers whent to the grayffe, and after brake ther stayffes, and cast them into the grayffe'; Gawdy, *Letters*, 128, of Elizabeth's, 'I saw all the whit staves broken uppon ther heades'.

[2] *Lord Chamberlains Books*, 811, ff. 178, 206, 236, contains warrants to the Wardrobe for the liveries of Lord Sussex, Lord Howard, and George Lord Hunsdon. The fee of £16 appears in a memorandum of 1606–7 (Nichols, *James*, ii. 125).

[3] The ordinary books of reference give a very inaccurate list of Elizabethan Chamberlains. I have collected the evidence in *M. S. C.* i. 31.

[4] Goodman, i. 178, says that Hunsdon was 'ever reputed a very honest man, but a very passionate man, a great swearer, and of little eminency'. Naunton (ed. Arber, 46) gives a similar account.

revels. But in 1614 he became Lord Treasurer, and on 10 July the Chamberlainship was conferred upon the then reigning royal favourite, Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, much to the disappointment of Shakespeare's patron, William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke, who had to content himself with a promise of the reversion.[1] This, however, fell in sooner than might have been hoped for. Somerset came to disaster for his share in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury in 1615, and on 2 November, shortly before he was sent to the Tower, Lord Wotton, the Comptroller of the Household, came from the King to demand his seals and the white staff. He handed over the seals, says our informant, the Venetian ambassador, 'and as for the staff, which he pointed out to him in a corner of the room, he might take it'. Lord Wotton replied that the King did not order him to take it, but Somerset to give it, 'which he did'.[2] Pembroke was appointed on 23 December 1615 and remained Lord Chamberlain until 3 August 1626, when he was succeeded by his brother Philip Earl of Montgomery.[3]

The illness, or employment elsewhere, of a Lord Chamberlain sometimes rendered necessary the appointment of a deputy. Both Howard of Effingham and Hunsdon appear to have acted in this capacity during Sussex's tenure of office; Howard in 1574–5 and Hunsdon in 1582. Similarly Howard de Walden acted without having the white staff during the second Lord Hunsdon's illness in 1602, and again for a month before his own appointment in 1603.[4] There was indeed provision for the regular assistance of the Lord Chamberlain by a Vice-Chamberlain, an officer who had existed at least as far back as the fourteenth century, and is probably indeed the 'submínister' of the thirteenth.[5] Elizabeth's fee lists provide for a Vice-Chamberlain at a fee of £66 13*s*. 4*d*. and a table at court. But the post was not always filled up. Sir Edward Rogers held it from 1558 to 1559, Sir Francis

[1] Stowe, *Annals*, 936; Birch, *James*, i. 336; Wotton, *Letters*, ii. 40, 41.

[2] *V. P.* xiv. 65; Camden, *James*, 14.

[3] Birch, *James*, i. 382; Camden, *James*, 15; *V. P.* xiv. 100. Philip Herbert himself became Earl of Pembroke at his brother's death on 10 Apr. 1630. He took the parliamentary side in politics, and surrendered his staff on 23 July 1641. Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex, although also a parliamentarian, succeeded him from 24 July 1641 to 12 Apr. 1642 (*L. Ch. Records*, v. 96).

[4] *M. S. C.* i. 34, 40. Howard of Effingham is described in the *Revels Accounts* (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 238) as 'my L. Chamberlayne the L. Haward' on 5 Dec. 1574, and more precisely in the Chamber Order Book of Worcester as 'Lord Chamberlayn in the absence of the E. of Sussex' in Aug. 1575 (Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 533).

[5] Nicolas, *P. C.* vi. ccxxi; cf. p. 37.

Knollys from 1559 to 1570, Sir Christopher Hatton from 1577 to 1587, and Sir Thomas Heneage from 1589 to 1595. There seem to have been vacancies from 1570 to 1577 and from 1595 to 1601, although Sir William Pickering's appointment was under consideration in 1572 and Sir Henry Lee's in 1597. During Hunsdon's illness there was much speculation as to the probability of a Vice-Chamberlain being appointed. Sir Walter Raleigh hoped for the post, but in February 1601 it was given to Sir John Stanhope, afterwards Lord Stanhope of Harrington, who kept it until 1616.[1]

The Chamber was less divided up into semi-independent working sections than the Lord Steward's department, although three of these, the Jewel House under a Master, and the Wardrobe of Robes and the Removing Wardrobe of Beds, each under a Yeoman, looked after the Queen's plate and jewels, her clothes, and the furniture of the Chamber respectively.[2] But there was an elaborate hierarchy of individual officers and groups of officers, each with definite and recognized functions to perform under the general superintendence of the Lord Chamberlain. The main basis of grading goes back to the social organization of the Middle Ages. In the fourteenth century every lay household officer fell within one or other of five well-defined grades. He was a knight banneret, a knight bachelor, an esquire (*scutifer*, *armiger*) or serjeant (*serviens*), a yeoman (*valettus*), or a groom (*garcio*). Pages and boys were later additions.[3] Each grade had its uniform rates of salary and allowances, and there was regular promotion from one to another. And while some officers of each grade were definitely assigned to special duties (*mestiers*), others were more loosely attached either to the Household as a whole or to the *camera* in particular. The clerical officers were similarly arranged in grades distinct from, but parallel to, those of the laymen. But between the fourteenth century and the sixteenth a good many changes had come about. The most important of these were due to the early Tudors, who had not merely made a distinction within the Chamber itself between the Privy Chamber and the Outer or Presence Chamber and their respective staffs, but

[1] Dasent, vii. 3, 43; Wright, i. 355; La Mothe, v. 60; *Sadleir Papers*, ii. 368, 410; *Sydney Papers*, ii. 89, 198, 216; Chamberlain, 100; *D. N. B.*

[2] Hearne, *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, i. 352, 'Portator lecti Regis in domo comedet, & homini suo iii ob. & i summarium cum liberacione sua'; cf. *H. O.* 39, 42, 251. These Wardrobes were distinct, alike from the Great Wardrobe and from the standing Wardrobes, to which the furniture of the permanently equipped palaces was committed (*H. O.* 262).

[3] *H. O.* 39.

had also, perhaps following a French model, brought into existence two hybrid grades in the Gentlemen and Grooms of the Privy Chamber.[1] 'Gentleman' has the same significance

[1] Carlisle, 11, assigns the institution of the Gentlemen to Henry VII, but this is inconsistent with the official document of 1638 printed by him (112), which definitely refers it to Henry VIII. He also gives from *Addl. MS.* 5758, ff. 263^{v}, 269^{v}, a list described by him as of Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber at the time of the King's 'French expedition, in 1513'. But in the manuscript the list is simply headed 'The Kinges prevy chamber'; it is part of an enumeration of 'the King's Trayne to Bulloyne', is not dated 1513, and probably belongs to 1544. Similarly a list of Gentlemen, printed by Brewer, ii. 871, from *Royal MS.* 7, F. xiv. 100, and dated by him 1516, proves on scrutiny to be certainly later than 1520, and may therefore be later still, while a number of alleged grants to Gentlemen and Grooms of the Privy Chamber between 1510 and 1514 (Brewer, i. 148, 195, 205, 280, 364, 748) may be seen by comparison with other entries for some of the same personages (i. 11, 18, 91, 96, 113, 243, 410, 425, 448, 493, 600, 612) to be merely due to bad abstracting. Evidently Brewer, when working upon his first volume, had not distinguished between a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber and a Gentleman Usher of the Chamber, or between a Groom of the Privy Chamber and a Groom of the Chamber. The first clear example of Grooms and Pages of the Privy Chamber which I have come across is in a military list of June 1513 (Brewer, i. 634). Here there are no Gentlemen, but in Sept. 1518 a parallel list of French and English names (Brewer, ii. 1357) has a section of Gentlemen of the Chamber, in which occur, besides French names, those of Sir E. Nevell, Arthur Poole, Nicolas Carewe, Francis Brian, Henry Norris, William Coffyn. I believe the categories of this list to be French rather than English. In 1520 (Brewer, iii. 244) a Chamber list gives the names of four squires for the body followed by 'William Cary in the Privy Chamber', and in the same year a list of quarterly wages due from the Treasurer of the Chamber (Brewer, iii. 408) has, besides four Grooms of the Privy Chamber at 50*s.* each, 'Henry Norris and William Caree of the privy chamber' at £8 6*s.* 8*d.* each. On the other hand, a list of Chamber officers of 1526, probably just before the Eltham Articles (*Lord Steward's Misc.* 299, f. 153), has still no Gentlemen, though it has Grooms of the Privy (here called 'King's') Chamber. As I read these facts, the distinction between the Outer and the Privy Chamber was made in Henry VII's reign or early in Henry VIII's. The Grooms were then divided into two classes. But the institution of the Gentlemen was later and apparently upon a French model. At first, about 1520, one or two Squires were personally assigned to attendance in the Privy Chamber. Then the arrangement was regulated, and a definite class of Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber established, by the Eltham Articles in 1526. As to *status*, the duties of the Gentlemen seem to have been in practice much those of the Squires of Household in the *Liber Niger* (1478), which were probably already exercised by Chaucer in the same capacity a century before. 'These Esquiers of houshold of old be accustumed, wynter and somer, in aftyrnoones and in eveninges, to drawe to lordes chambres within courte, there to kepe honest company aftyr theyre cunnynge, in talkyng of cronycles of kings and of other polycyes, or in pypeyng, or harpyng, syngyng, or other actes martialles, to help occupy the courte, and accompany straungers, tyll the tyme require of departing' (*H. O.* 46). Stowe (*Annales*, 565), describing the coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533, calls the Gentlemen 'Esquires of Honour'. Their precedence under

as ' Esquire ', but this particular group, whose members were intended to be the personal companions of the Sovereign, seems to have been an amalgamation of two groups belonging to the earlier establishment, one squirely, the Esquires of the Household, the other knightly, the Knights of the Body. And if the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber were more nearly knights than esquires, the Grooms of the Privy Chamber were in like manner more nearly esquires than grooms or even yeomen.[1] Probably, however, they replaced an earlier group of Yeomen of the Chamber. The duties of the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber, in addition to those of companionship, seem to have consisted chiefly in dressing and undressing the Sovereign. The Grooms attended to the orderliness of the rooms, and were supervised, under the Chamberlain, by officers holding a very ancient post, the *hostiarii camerae* or Gentlemen Ushers.[2] Obviously the normal staffing of the Privy Chamber required some modification in the case of a virgin queen. Elizabeth appears usually to have had no more than two or three Gentlemen and from five to ten Grooms, in place of the eighteen Gentlemen and fourteen Grooms provided for in the fee lists, and to have supplemented these by making feminine appointments in corresponding grades. There were Ladies or Gentlewomen, some of the Bedchamber and some of the Privy Chamber, and beneath these Chamberers, who appear also to have been known as ' the Queen's Women '.[3] The First Lady of the Privy Chamber acted as Mistress of the Robes, and she or another of the

Elizabeth was after that of the Esquires of the Body (Carlisle, 86). On the other hand, some of the Gentlemen appointed in 1526 had been Knights of the Body, and the office of Knight of the Body appears shortly after to have become obsolete. Knights are included as chamber officers in the Elizabethan fee lists, but I can find no evidence that any were in fact appointed.

[1] The Grooms were distinguished from the Gentlemen in the post-Restoration court (Chamberlayne, 247) by not wearing sword, cloak, or hat in the Chamber.

[2] *Constitutio Domus Regis* (*c.* 1135) in Hearne, *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, i. 356, ' Hostiarius Camerae unaquaque die, quo Rex iter agit, iiij^{d} ad lectum Regis ' ; cf. *H. O.* 37, and p. 37, *supra*. On the etiquette of Bedchamber service, as inherited from the fifteenth century, cf. Furnivall, *Babee's Book*, 175, 313.

[3] The feminine posts do not appear in the fee lists. *Lansd. MS.* lix, f. 43, gives (*c.* 1588) two ladies at 50 marks (£33 6*s.* 8*d.*) and one at £20 as ' The Bed chamber ', five at 50 marks as ' Gentlewomen of y^{e} privey Chamber ', and four at £20 as ' Chamberers '. The term ' The Queen's Women ' appears in the list of liveries for Elizabeth's funeral. Beyond these there were probably only a few women, e. g. a ' lawndrys ', employed at court ; cf. Cheyney, i. 18. In the New Year Gift lists the official women are mixed up with wives of men officers and others in attendance at court.

Ladies took charge of the jewels actually in use by the Queen and accounted for them to the Jewel-house.[1] In addition there were the six Maids of Honour, who were not salaried officers, but girls of good birth, for whom the court served as a finishing school of manners, and who attended the Queen in public, sat and walked with her in the Privy Chamber and Privy Garden, and kept her entertained with the dancing which she delighted to witness. They were generally dressed in white, and were lodged in the Coffer Chamber under the care of a lady called the Mother of the Maids.[2] And they learnt other things at the court besides manners. Gossip is full of the troubles which Elizabeth underwent in the attempt to establish the cult of Cynthia amongst the maids of honour and the younger ladies of the Privy Chamber.[3] A few older ladies of rank, some of them relatives of the Queen, were also assigned lodgings in court, and were apparently known as Ladies of the Presence Chamber.[4]

The Outer Chamber was also supervised by Gentlemen Ushers, some in daily, others in quarterly waiting, with Grooms of the Chamber, headed by a Groom Porter, and Pages of the Chamber under them to maintain the apartments in order, Yeomen Ushers to keep the doors, and a body of Messengers of the Chamber, ranking with the Yeomen, who besides their domestic uses were at the disposal of the Privy Council and the Secretaries for political purposes, and become very numerous by the end of the reign.[5] The

[1] Katharine Astley seems to have been First Lady in 1562 (Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 116), Katharine Howard, afterwards Lady Howard of Effingham, from 1572–87 (*Sloane MS.* 814; Nichols, i. 294; ii. 65, 251; *Sp. P.* ii. 661), and Dorothy Lady Stafford in 1587 (*Sp. P.* iv. 14). But Mary Ratcliffe had charge of the jewels from July 1587 to the end of Elizabeth's reign (Nichols, iii. 1, 445; *Egerton Papers*, 313; *S. P. D. Jac. I*, i. 79; *Addl. MS.* 5751, f. 222; *Royal MS. Appendix*, 68), apparently in succession to Blanche Parry.

[2] For the white dresses, cf. App. F; *Sydney Papers*, ii. 170; *S. P. D. Eliz.* cclxxxii. 48 (vol. iv, p. 114); L. Cust in *Trans. Walpole Soc.* iii. 12; for the lodging in the Coffer Chamber, doubtless where the 'sweet coffers' were kept, *Sydney Papers*, ii. 38. Elizabeth's predecessors, at least from the reign of Edward II (Tout, 280; cf. *H. O.* 44), had maintained some of the young lads who were royal wards at court under the name of Henchmen, but on 11 Dec. 1565 Francis Alen wrote to Lord Shrewsbury (Lodge, i. 438), 'Her Highness hath of late, whereat some do much marvel, dissolved the ancient office of the Henchmen'.

[3] This may be exemplified from the histories of Robert Dudley and Mrs. Cavendish, of Walter Raleigh and Elizabeth Throgmorton, of Robert Tyrwhitt and Bridget Manners, of Southampton and Elizabeth Vernon, of Essex and Elizabeth Brydges, Mary Howard, Elizabeth Russell and Elizabeth Southwell, and of Pembroke and Mary Fitton.

[4] Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 24; *Sp. P.* i. 45; ii. 675.

[5] Philip Henslowe (ch. xi), George Bryan (ch. xv), and John Singer

Gentlemen Ushers also took part in the arrangements for lodging the court during progresses, in co-operation with a Knight Harbinger and four subordinate Harbingers who went in advance as billeting officers.[1] To the Outer Chamber, moreover, belonged the Esquires of the Body, who slept in the Presence Chamber, and took charge of the whole Chamber after the ceremony known as the All Night at nine o'clock, and a group of officers 'for the mouth', including Carvers, Cupbearers, Sewers for the Queen, and Surveyors of the Dresser.[2] These had anciently been of importance, all ranking as esquires, and the Carvers and Cupbearers from the fifteenth century as knights.[3] But their functions had dwindled, like those of the Hall officers at an earlier date, when the Tudor sovereigns ceased as a rule to dine even in the Presence Chamber, and by the end of the reign the posts of Carver and Cupbearer were claimed by great nobles as dignified sinecures.[4] The actual service of Elizabeth's meals was done by her ladies.[5] Similarly the Sewers for the Chamber, who apparently represent those of the Esquires of the Household who did not become Gentlemen of the Chamber, had probably neither duties nor salaries under Elizabeth.[6] It had long proved convenient to the Crown to entertain a number of nominal servants, who without giving actual attendance in the household upon ordinary occasions, could be called upon for the great ceremonies of state or for the household array in times of battle, and at other times helped to increase the royal prestige and to strengthen the royal hold upon the localities in which they lived.[7] And naturally there were

(ch. xv) were Grooms, and Anthony Munday (ch. xxii) and possibly Lawrence Dutton (ch. xv) Messengers of the Chamber.

[1] Cf. ch. iv. I doubt whether the Harbingers were originally Chamber officers, but they seem to be so classed under Henry VIII (*H. O.* 169) and in the Elizabethan fee lists.

[2] An order of 1493 'for all night' is in *H. O.* 109; Pegge, ii. 16, has a long account of the same usage in the post-Restoration Household. John Lyly (ch. xxiii) and Sir George Buck (ch. iii) were Esquires of the Body. A brawl in 1598 between the Earl of Southampton and Ambrose Willoughby, who was in charge of the Presence Chamber as Esquire of the Body after the Queen had gone to bed, is recorded in *Sydney Papers*, ii. 83.

[3] *H. O.* 33 (*c.* 1478), 'In the noble Edwardes [Ed. III] dayes worshipfull esquires did this servyce, but now thus for the more worthy'.

[4] At Elizabeth's funeral the Earl of Shrewsbury had a livery as Cupbearer and the Earl of Sussex as Carver.

[5] Cf. App. F.

[6] Philip Henslowe (ch. xi) became a Sewer of the Chamber.

[7] Brewer, ii. 871 (assigned to 1516, but probably later than 1526). The livery list for Elizabeth's coronation includes 7 Ladies of the Privy Chamber 'without wages' and 11 others 'extraordinary', 4 'ordinary'

many aspirants to the *status* and the protection which even a nominal membership of the royal household afforded. Survivals, such as the Sewerships for the Chamber, were well adapted to this purpose, but it was also possible to meet it by appointing supernumerary members to effective groups.[1] Elizabeth certainly made many 'extraordinary' as well as 'ordinary' appointments, especially of Esquires of the Body and Grooms of the Chamber, and a status midway between the ordinary and extraordinary Grooms seems to have been assigned to the players belonging to companies under the royal patronage.[2] It may be that the 'extraordinary' appointments were sometimes of the nature of grants in reversion, and that the holders looked forward to passing on to 'ordinary' posts in due course.[3]

Duties in the Outer Chamber were also fulfilled by the various bodies of royal guards. Of these there were three. The oldest was constituted by the Serjeants-at-Arms, who held the rank of Esquires, and were appointed by investment with the collar of SS at the hands of the Sovereign on the way to chapel.[4] They are little heard of under Elizabeth, and their posts were probably to a large extent honorific. The Yeomen of the Guard were a foot-guard established by Henry VII in 1485. The Yeomen Ushers of the Chamber were selected from amongst them, and on their establishment an older body of Yeomen of the Crown, itself in origin a guard of archers, seems to have been allowed to lapse.[5] The Yeomen were the working palace guard, and were under a Captain, a Standard Bearer, and a Clerk of the Cheque.[6] The Gentlemen Pensioners or 'Spears' were a horse-guard established by Henry VIII in 1509.[7] Both these Tudor guards seem to

Esquires of the Body, and 6 Gentlemen Waiters (i. e. of the Privy Chamber) 'unplaced'; that for her funeral 16 Grooms of the Chamber 'in ordinarie' and 23 'extraordinary, but daily attendant', 5 Pages of the Chamber 'in ordinary' and 3 'extraordinary', and a number of Esquires of the Body and Sewers of the Chamber far in excess of anything contemplated by the fee lists.

[1] Batiffol, 93, describes a similar practice in the French household.

[2] Cf. ch. xiii (Queen's, King's).

[3] Philip Henslowe (ch. xi) seems to have passed from the 'extraordinary' to the 'ordinary' status as Groom of the Chamber.

[4] Pegge, v. 49. There were 'xx servientes, unusquisque j^{d} in die' in the *Domus* of Henry I (Hearne, *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, i. 356).

[5] Pegge, iii; Tout, 304 (1318): 'Item xxiiij archers a pee, garde corps le roi, qirrount deuaunt le roi en cheminant par pays'; *H. O.* 38 (1478).

[6] Sir Christopher Hatton was Captain of the Guard 1572–87, Sir Walter Raleigh 1587–1603, Sir Thomas Erskine, afterwards Viscount Fenton (1605) and Earl of Kelly (1619), 1603–32.

[7] Halle, i. 14; ii. 294; Pegge, ii. An Elizabethan book of orders for the Pensioners (1601) is in *H. O.* 276.

have been modelled on analogous French establishments. The Pensioners had a Captain, a Lieutenant, a Standard Bearer, and a Clerk of the Cheque. They were gentlemen of good birth, and to them the Court looked for its supply of accomplished tilters. They attended the Queen, bearing gilded battle-axes, on her way to chapel, and in public processions.[1] By the sixteenth century the control of the guards clearly fell within the sphere of the Lord Chamberlain. Both the Hunsdons themselves acted as Captains of the Pensioners, and the Captaincy of the Yeomen was sometimes, although not always, attached to the Vice-Chamberlainship.

The Secretaries, with the Clerks of the Signet and Privy Council, the Master of the Posts, and the Masters of Requests, although they had grown out of the Chamber, and were still, like the Lords Treasurer, Chancellor, Admiral, and Privy Seal, lodged in the Household, cannot at this period be regarded as under the Lord Chamberlain.[2] But he had some responsibility for the royal Chaplains, the Chapel, the Vestry, and the Clerks of the Closet, whence the Queen heard prayers, especially after Elizabeth suppressed the Deanship of the Chapel.[3] And he controlled the physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries, the astronomer, the serjeant-painter, the surveyor of ways, the various hunting equipages, the rat-taker and mole-taker, and a number of artificers ministering to the diverse needs of the Queen and the palace. Probably he controlled the royal fools and other survivals of that characteristic mediaeval interest in mental and physical abnormality.[4] And, what is more to our purpose, he certainly controlled the players, and the extensive establishment of musicians. Amongst these the old royal *ministralli* or

[1] Cf. App. F.

[2] On the development of the Secretaries, cf. Tout, 175; Davies, 228; Nicolas, *P. C.* vi, xcvii; Cheyney, i. 43; R. H. Gretton, *The King's Government*, 25; L. H. Dibben, *Secretaries in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (*E. H. R.* xxv. 430).

[3] On the Chapel, cf. ch. xii, s.v.

[4] Payments on account of Robert Grene, a court fool, appear in the *Privy Purse Accounts* for 1559–69 (Nichols, i. 264). Apparently the post was hereditary; a warrant of 1567 for the clothes of 'Jack Grene our foole' is in *Addl. MS.* 35328. C. C. Stopes, *Elizabeth's Fools and Dwarfs* (*Shakespeare's Environment*, 269), adds from a Wardrobe book of 1577–1600 (*Lord Chamb. Books*, v. 36) 'Thomasina', a dwarf or *muliercula*, and from another (*Lord Chamb. Books*, v. 34) 'The Foole', 'William Shenton our Foole', 'Ipolyta the Tartarian', 'an Italian named Monarcho', 'a lytle Blackamore'. References to Monarcho, including *L. L. L.* iv. i. 101, are collected in *Var.* iv. 345, and McKerrow, *Nashe*, iv. 339. Dee, 7, records a visit from the Queen's dwarf 'Mrs Thomasin' on 7 June 1580.

histriones of the Middle Ages, with their *marescallus*, were still represented by a body of trumpeters under a serjeant.[1] But the personal taste of Henry VIII for music had brought a stream of new performers to court, and this had continued under Elizabeth. Many of them were of foreign extraction, and certain families, such as the Laniers, the Ferrabosci, the Bassani of Venice, or rather, as their name denotes, of Bassano in the Veneto, the Lupi of Milan, formed little dynasties of their own at court, father, son, and grandson succeeding each other, in the royal service through the best part of a century. At the end of her reign Elizabeth was entertaining at least seven distinct bodies of musicians, whose members numbered in all between sixty and seventy. For wind instruments there were, besides the trumpeters, the recorders, the flutes, and the hautboys and sackbuts; for string instruments the viols or violins and the lutes. There were also an organist attached to the chapel and possibly players on the virginals.[2] The most important of these were the lutenists, who sang as well as played, and often composed their own songs, and appear to have been of higher standing than the mere instrumentalists. One of them was specially designated as the Lute of the Privy Chamber.[3] It seems probable that some of the superfluous Sewerships for the Chamber were conferred on them, and Alfonso Ferrabosco may have been about 1575 a Groom of the Chamber.[4]

Finally, there were a number of offices, called in Elizabethan parlance 'standing offices', each under a Master or other head of its own, which can only be regarded as on the borderline of the Household. These were the Great Wardrobe, the Revels, the Tents, the Toils, the Works, the Armoury, the Ordnance, and the Mint. They were financed separately from the Household, and had their various head-quarters in London away from the palace. But their officers were

[1] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 50.

[2] Lafontaine, 45. Numerous records of the musical establishment are collected by Lafontaine from the *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, and by W. Nagel, *Annalen der englischen Hofmusik* (*Beilage zu den Monatsheften für Musikgeschichte*, Bd. 26), and more completely in the *Musical Antiquary* (Oct. 1909–Apr. 1913) from the *T. C. Accounts*. The fee lists are not to be relied upon.

[3] This was Mathias Mason. The lutenists also include Robert Hales (1586–1603), Henry Porter (1603), also described in the same year as a sackbut, and Philip Rosseter (1604–23), on whom cf. ch. xv.

[4] John Heywood was certainly a Sewer of the chamber to Henry VIII (cf. ch. xii, s.v. Paul's), and Edward VI had a group of singers holding these posts (Lafontaine, 9), but there is no definite evidence of a similar arrangement under Elizabeth. On Alfonso Ferrabosco, cf. ch. xiv (Italians).

regarded as members of the Household, and although largely independent, they were in many or all cases subject to some kind of supervision by the Lord Chamberlain.[1] Probably the explanation of their origin is given by a phrase used about 1478 by the writer of the *Liber Niger*. Here the Wardrobe is spoken of as 'an office of chaumbre outward'.[2] In these standing offices, and also in the Secretariat, we seem to have examples of that budding off from the main administrative organization by which those great departments of state, the Exchequer and the Chancery, had already come into existence. Doubtless the process was facilitated, when considerations of practical convenience and a desire to reduce the number of mouths to be provided for in the palace led to the location of particular branches of work in permanent and independent premises. The history of the Revels Office, which will form the subject of another chapter, well serves to illustrate the kind of development involved.[3]

Members of the standing offices were generally appointed for life, those of the regular Household during the royal pleasure. The former received letters patent; the latter were only sworn in before one or other of the chief officers, and as most of the early records of the Lord Chamberlain's department have perished, no complete list of them is upon record. The uniform rates of pay and allowances for each grade of officer which prevailed in the fourteenth century had undergone many complications by the middle of the sixteenth. Each officer had, of course, his fee or wages, payable either at the Exchequer or by the Treasurer of the Chamber, whose functions will shortly be described, or, as in the case of most of the regular officers of Household and Chamber, by the Cofferer of the Household. The rates had gradually increased, perhaps with a decrease in the purchasing power of money. Those for the recently established Tudor posts were reckoned in pounds; the older ones in marks. Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber and Pensioners got £50, Esquires of the Body £33 6*s.* 8*d.* (fifty marks), Gentlemen Ushers of the Privy Chamber £30, Grooms of the Privy Chamber £20, Grooms of the Chamber £2 13*s.* 4*d.* (four marks). These may serve for examples. Obsolete mediaeval rates of

[1] On the relation of the Lord Chamberlain to the Revels in particular, cf. ch. iii. The issues from the Great Wardrobe were mainly upon his warrants.

[2] *H. O.* 37. The post of Clerk of Works is also called an 'office outward' (*H. O.* 54).

[3] Cf. ch. iii, especially Tilney's list of 'standing offices' *c.* 1607. The 'maisters of the standing offices' also appear in the description of James's coronation (Nichols, *James*, i. 325).

so many pence a day still survived here and there.[1] The Grooms and Pages of the Chamber had also a traditional 'great reward' of £100 among them at Christmas, while the fees payable to the officers of the Chamber by lay and ecclesiastic homagers were not—and are not yet—extinct.[2] Exceptional 'rewards', from foreign visitors of rank and so forth, were naturally forthcoming from time to time, and, as naturally, largesse often became indistinguishable from bribe. The allowances, other than salary, were of several kinds. Firstly, there was diet, that is to say, dinner and supper at the appointed tables in hall or chamber. Most of the officers of the regular Household enjoyed this; a few, whose attendance was not required daily or at all times in the day, received instead a money allowance from the Cofferer known as 'board wages'.[3] Secondly, there was 'bouche of court', a commons of bread and ale, candles and fuel, served only to those of sufficient rank to be lodged in the palace itself.[4] It is probably an evidence, not of economy, but of change of social habits, that in the sixteenth century ale had replaced the wine of the fourteenth. Originally the 'bouche of court' had to suffice for breakfast, but under Elizabeth the Maids of Honour and a few other favoured groups were allowed to share the queen's breakfast of beef.[5] Thirdly, there was 'livery' in the narrow sense, clothes or the material for clothes from the Great Wardrobe, or a money payment in lieu thereof. Even in the fourteenth century there was already much commutation of livery, which in the case of yeomen and grooms also included an allowance for shoes, known as *calciatura*. By the end of the fifteenth century it was definitely thought derogatory for men of rank to wear even the sovereign's livery, except in some quite symbolical form.[6] Under Elizabeth some of the salaries seem to have

[1] Thus the curious fee of £11 8*s*. 1½*d*. a year represents 7½*d*. a day, the regular wages of esquires, serjeants, and many clerks under Edward II (Tout, 270).

[2] The £100 was 'from the King's privy coffers' *c*. 1478 (*H. O.* 41), but by 1508 it was from the Exchequer (Henry, *Hist. of Great Britain*, xii. 454), and here it was still paid in the seventeenth century (Sullivan, 252, from *Pells Order Books*).

[3] Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 47, from return of Board of Green Cloth (1576).

[4] Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 45, 51. 'Bouche' or 'bouge' of court is clearly from *busca*, bush, firewood. The allowance was as old as 1290, for *Fleta*, ii. 7, notes *cibus*, *potus*, *busca*, and *candela* amongst the Chamberlain's fees (cf. p. 37). It is set out for each officer in 1318 (Tout, 270) and *c*. 1478 (*H. O.* 15).

[5] Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 44.

[6] *H. O.* 34, 'because ray clothinge is not according for the king's knightes, therefore it was left'. But an order of June 1478 (*T. R. Misc.* 206, f. 11)

had livery allowances added on to them. The process of commutation can still be traced. But liveries were issued in kind to the yeomen, messengers, grooms, pages, and stable footmen. These seem to have been of two kinds; 'watching' liveries issued from the Wardrobe in the winter, and 'summer' liveries, for which payment was made direct from the Exchequer.[1] The latter were gorgeous and costly, of scarlet cloth, with spangles and embroidery of Venice gold, taking the shape of a rose and crown and the letters 'E. R.', with some distinction between yeomen and grooms. The present costume of the Yeomen of the Guard, or 'beef-eaters', is a later modification of this livery.[2] In their capacity as Grooms of the Chamber the royal players were entitled to wear the Queen's 'coat'.[3] The officers of the standing offices had livery or livery allowance, if it was appropriate to their rank. They did not have diet or 'bouche of court'. But they were in some cases entitled to supplement their fees by charging 'wages' for actual days of service in the accounts which their Masters annually rendered to the Exchequer.[4] 'Extraordinary' officers probably got no salaries or allowances of any kind, unless they were called up for special duty. But it must be added that all royal servants, whatever their office, and whether 'ordinary' or 'extraordinary', received a customary allowance of red cloth at the coronation and of black cloth at a royal funeral, and that the schedules of recipients on these occasions form the most complete establishment lists available.

The accession of James did not materially alter the general structure of the Household. The chief changes were in the Privy Chamber. The Wardrobe of Robes was placed under a Gentleman, afterwards called a Master. The Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber were increased in number, reduced to quarterly terms of waiting, and deprived of salary.[5] The salaries of the Lord Chamberlain, Gentlemen Ushers, and

required Lords, Knights, Squires of the Body, and others within the household to wear 'a colour of the kings livery about their nekkes'.

[1] Cheyney, i. 32; Devon, 24, 43, 67, 83; *Abstract*, 8; Pegge, iii. 27; Nichols, *James*, ii. 125; *V. P.* vii. 12; Hentzner, *Itinerarium* (quoted App. F); *Addl. MS.* 5750, f. 114; *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, v. 90, 91. The 'watchyng clothing' is as old as Edward IV (*H. O.* 38, 41). It seems to have been 4 yards of medley colour at 5*s.* a yard (Sullivan, 253). The sovereigns seem to have made some use of personal colours as distinct from the royal scarlet. Those of Edward VI were green and white (Von Raumer, ii. 71); those of Elizabeth black and white; cf. pp. 142, 161 (1559, 1560, 1564).

[2] Pegge, iii. 92. [3] Cf. ch. xiii (Queen's). [4] Cf. ch. iii.

[5] Carlisle, 90, with a list of many of James's Gentlemen.

Grooms were raised. And what was practically a new department was brought into existence in the Bedchamber, which had a staff of Gentlemen, Grooms, and Pages, independent of the Lord Chamberlain and controlled by their own First Gentleman, who was also known as Groom of the Stole.[1] The Bed Chamber, chiefly composed of Scots, furnished James with his most confidential servants.[2] As might be expected, James enlarged his hunting establishment, and one of his new appointments was a Cockmaster.[3] He had a conspicuous Fool in Archie Armstrong.[4] And he instituted in the Lord Chamberlain's department an officer known as the Master of the Ceremonies, whose function was to look after the lodgings and the general well-being of ambassadors, and to grapple with the knotty problems entailed by their inveterate stickling for precedence and etiquette.[5] A separate household was formed for the Queen, to which the various grades of ladies

[1] The order of 1526 for the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber prescribes that one of them, Henry Norris, 'shall be in the roome of Sir William Compton, not only giveing his attendance as groome of the Kings stoole, but also in his bed-chamber, and other privy places, as shall stand with his pleasure' (*H. O.* 156). Naturally the post had lapsed during female reigns, although a hope of Sir Robert Sidney for a 'Bedchamber lordship' in 1597 suggests that a renewal may have been contemplated (*Hatfield MSS.* vii. 225). James had had Gentlemen of the Bed Chamber in Scotland. Later court usage, represented already by Chamberlayne, 262, in 1669, interpreted 'stole' as 'vestment', but I suspect that in origin it was the close stool, which was kept *c.* 1478 by the Wardrobe of Beds (*H. O.* 40); cf. Marston, *Fawn*, I. ii. 46, 'Thou art private with the duke; thou belongest to his close-stool'.

[2] Goodman, i. 389, says that the prime gentleman of the bed chamber and groom of the stole was 'a man of special trust' and had a table for guests 'employed in the king's most private occasions'. Viscount Fenton combined the post with that of Captain of the Guard under James. According to Newcastle, 213, the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke laboured in vain to be of the Bed Chamber throughout the reign. Carey, *Memoirs*, 79, 91, describes the heart-burnings to which the office gave rise. Robert Carr, afterwards Earl of Somerset, began his career as a Page of the Bed Chamber (Nichols, *James*, i. 600).

[3] *S. P. D. Jac. I* (8 Nov. 1604). The French ambassador wrote in 1606 (Boderie, i. 56) that the king 'vit combattre les cocqs, qui est un plaisir qu'il prend deux fois la semaine'.

[4] Cf. *D. N. B.*. Anne also had a 'jester', Thomas Derry, in 1612 (Cunningham, xliii).

[5] *Abstract*, 46; Devon, 17, 72 and *passim*; *Cott. MS. Vesp.* C. xiv, f. 108; *Addl. MS.* 33378, f. 34^{v}; *V. P.* x. 102; Sully, 443; Boderie, i. 39, 272, 362. Sir Lewis Lewknor received a formal appointment as Master of Ceremonies by patent, with a salary of £200, on 7 Nov. 1605, but had in fact been exercising the functions since 1603. Amongst his assistants were Sir William Button, who was employed by 1607 and obtained a reversion of the post on 10 Sept. 1612, and John Finett, who ultimately himself became Master, and published a record of his service from 1612 in his *Philoxenis* (1656).

found at Elizabeth's court were transferred.[1] There were minor households for the royal children. That of Henry was much enlarged when he was created Prince of Wales in 1610, and in many respects, especially on the literary and artistic side, came to rival his father's.

One other officer, whose name has already been mentioned, must now, in virtue of his special relation to the playing companies, be fully considered. This is the Treasurer of the Chamber. His history affords an admirable example of that capacity of duplicating the functions of the departments of state, which was inherent in the Household as the successor in a direct line of the undifferentiated *curia regis*. After the development of the Exchequer was completed in the course of the twelfth century, the great bulk of the royal revenue was dealt with by that organization, and payments into and out of the royal account were made through the clerks of the branch known as the Receipt of the Exchequer. The posts of *camerarius* and *thesaurarius* were now distinct. But the change was never quite exhaustively carried out. Presumably the sovereign found it convenient to retain a certain residue of his funds under his personal control. Side by side with the Exchequer and its great officer it is still possible to trace into the thirteenth century a *thesaurus camerae regis* and a *thesaurarius camerae*; and the Pipe Rolls continue to refer to payments made *in camera curiae*, or *ipsi regi in camera curiae*, and to receipts taken by debtors *de camera curiae*, both of which were certified to the Exchequer *per breve regis* and put on final record there.[2] There were also *clerici camerae*, who probably wrote these *brevia*, and it is conjectured that the privy seal, as distinct from the great

[1] Worcester to Shrewsbury, 2 Feb. 1604 (Lodge, iii. 88): 'Now, having done with matters of state, I must a little touch the feminine commonwealth, that against your coming you be not altogether like an ignorant country fellow. First, you must know we have ladies of divers degrees of favour; some for the private chamber, some for the drawing chamber, some for the bed-chamber, and some for neither certain, and of this number is only my Lady Arabella and my wife. My Lady Bedford holdeth fast to the bed-chamber; my Lady Harford would fain, but her husband hath called her home. My Lady Derby the younger, the Lady Suffolk, Ritche, Nottingham, Susan, Walsingham, and, of late, the Lady Sothwell, for the drawing-chamber; all the rest for the private-chamber, when they are not shut out, for many times the doors are locked; but the plotting and malice amongst them is such, that I think envy hath tied an invisible snake about most of their necks to sting one another to death. For the present there are now five maids; Cary, Myddelmore, Woodhouse, Gargrave, Roper; the sixth is determined, but not come; God send them good fortune, for as yet they have no mother.'

[2] Madox, i. 262; Thomas, 24; Tout in *E. H. R.* xxiv. 496.

seal of Chancery, came into existence as a means of authenticating the *brevia* as impressed with royal authority. Thus the *camera* was able to duplicate the functions of the Chancery as well as those of the Exchequer.[1] About the middle of the thirteenth century the Pipe Rolls take to referring to the exceptional financial transactions as taking place not in the *camera* but in the *garderoba*. There are *clerici garderobae* and a chief officer called indifferently the *custos* and the *thesaurarius garderobae*.[2] Presumably the *garderoba* or 'wardrobe' was at first merely that apartment of the *camera* in which the financial work was done, and there are still indications of some such early relationship in the position of the Wardrobe when we first get a clear view of the operations at the very end of the century.[3] But by this time its scope had greatly increased, owing to the policy of Henry III and Edward I, who found in it a financial and administrative instrument, both more ready to hand and less subject to baronial control and criticism than either the Exchequer or the Chancery. Much of the revenue had come to pass through its hands, under a system of tallies, which were issued to it in block by the Exchequer on the authority of a royal warrant dormant, exchanged for incomings with accountants, and ultimately presented as vouchers at the Exchequer of Account. As part of the same process, the clerical head of the Wardrobe had acquired an importance almost equal to that of the Chamberlain. Indeed, so far as he was controlled by any lay officer, it was less the Chamberlain than the Steward, under whom he sat at the daily review of household expenditure which formed a feature of the Wardrobe system, and was continued into Tudor times by the Board of Green Cloth. Here also sat a *consocius* of the Treasurer, the *contrarotulator*, who kept duplicates of his accounts as a check upon him, and had the charge of the privy seal. The Wardrobe held not only the money and jewels of the King, but also his 'secrets'. Its officers were his *secretarii* in the earlier unspecialized sense, his confidential agents, both in finance and in diplomacy and other affairs of state. The extant account-books show that it not merely defrayed the expenses of his household, his alms, and his amusements, but also those

[1] Tout, 63.

[2] Madox, i. 267; *P. R. O. Lists and Indexes*, xi. 102; Tout in *E. H. R.* xxiv. 496. The following summary of the history of the wardrobe and chamber in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries is largely based on Tout, *The Place of Edward II in English History* (1914). Additional material has since been published in J. C. Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (1918).

[3] *Fleta*, ii. 6, quoted on p. 37.

entailed by the fortification and victualling of his castles, and the wages and equipment of his army and navy and his ambassadors and other *nuntii*.

During the reign of Edward II the power of the Wardrobe was broken up, partly by the direct action of baronial hostility, partly by a discreet process of reorganization within the household, in the face of baronial criticism. The responsibilities of the Treasurer and Comptroller were limited to the purely domestic expenditure of the Steward's department, much as we find them in Tudor times. The charge of the privy seal was dissociated from the Comptrollership; its use, like that of the great seal before it, was subjected to regulation in the baronial interest; and it soon became superfluous. Offices, such as the Great Wardrobe for the purveyance of cloth, furs, and other bulky commodities, which had recently come into existence as branches of the Wardrobe, were now placed on an independent footing, and began to account direct to the Exchequer. And now once more, after remaining in obscurity for the best part of a century, emerges into renewed activity the financial organization of the Chamber. To it appears to have been assigned, as part of the scheme of reform, such expenditure as could not with propriety be withdrawn from the personal supervision of the sovereign.[1] With this as a nucleus, it was not particularly difficult to convert the Chamber into just such a financial and administrative organ as the Wardrobe had been before it. The funds at its disposal were gradually increased, as opportunities offered themselves of adding to them the revenues of one escheated manor after another. Its clerks in turn became the *secretarii*, out of whom the royal Secretaries in the Tudor sense were in course of time developed. Even the lost privy seal proved capable of replacement by a series of other small seals, the 'secret' seal under Edward II, the 'griffin' seal under Edward III, and finally the 'signet', which remained to the end in the hands of the Secretaries. It was only up to a point that the trained bureaucrats, with the power of knowledge behind them, proved amenable to baronial control. It is probably only up to a point that they will prove amenable to democratic control.

The actual use made of the Chamber varied considerably

[1] J. C. Davies, *The First Journal of Edward II's Chamber* (1915, *E. H. R.* xxx. 662), gives extracts from a Chamber account of 1322–3, including a payment of 7 Jan. 1323 'a iiij clers de Sneyth iuantz entreludies en la sale de Couwyk deuant le Roi et monsire Hugh [le Despenser] de doun le Roi par les mayns Harsik liuerant a eux les deniers xl^{s}', which adds an interesting early use of the term 'interlude' to those given in *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 181, 256.

in different reigns. It flourished at the end of the reign of Edward II, and again during the first half of that of Edward III. Soon after the middle of the fourteenth century, it lost much of its political status, owing to the separation from it of the Secretaries, who now had their own clerks in the Signet Office, and on the financial side it was for long little more than a privy purse in strict subordination to the Exchequer. It was still, however, capable at need of serving as a medium of war expenditure, and with the appointment of Thomas Vaughan by Edward IV in 1465 its financial importance began to revive.[1] Up to the end of the fourteenth century, its financial officers are generally called Receivers of the Chamber; during the next the double title of Treasurer of the Chamber and Keeper of the King's Jewels establishes itself.[2] They are sometimes, although perhaps not always, appointed by patent, and at any rate from the time of Henry IV are only accountable to the King in person.[3] On the execution of Vaughan in 1583 the posts of Treasurer of the Chamber and Keeper of the Jewels were divided; and it may serve as an illustration of the conservatism of courts that this was still a subject of grievance in the Jewel House two hundred years later.[4]

At the beginning of Henry VII's reign the functions of Treasurer of the Chamber were discharged by Thomas, afterwards Sir Thomas, Lovell.[5] On his appointment as Treasurer

[1] Newton, 351; Ramsay, *Lancaster and York*, i. 317; ii. 466. Henry VIII's Treasurers of the Chamber sometimes kept separate war accounts (Brewer, iv. 1. 82), and there is a similar example as late as 1599 (*R. O. Audit Office, Various*, 3, 108).

[2] *P. R. O. Lists and Indexes*, xxxv. 220, and *Cal. Patent Rolls*, both *passim*.

[3] *C. P. R., 1 Hen. VI*, p. 3, m. 5 (3 May 1423), *5 Edw. IV*, p. 2, m. 28 (29 June 1465), *1 Rich. III*, p. 5, m. 21 (26 Apr. 1484). I think Newton is wrong in regarding Vaughan's appointment by patent as exceptional. The *Liber Niger*, *c.* 1478 (*H. O.* 42), fully describes the Jewel House, with its 'architectour, called clerk of the King's, or keeper of the King's jewelles, or tresorer of the chambyr', and says 'all thinges of this office inward or outward, commyth and goyth by the knowledge of the Kyng, and his chamberlaynes recorde'.

[4] Sir Gilbert Talbot, Master of the Jewel House in 1680, represented (*Archaeologia*, xxii. 118) that anciently the Master was Treasurer of the Chamber, 'till that branch was taken out and made an office apart; and is now five times more beneficiall than the Jewell-House; all the regulation of expence being apply'd to the remaining parts of the perquisites of the Jewell-House, the fees of the Treasurer of the Chamber and Master of the Ceremonys being left entire'.

[5] Campbell, i. 228, 316; ii. 105, 296, 320, 445. Newton, 351, 353, thinks the exact dates of Edmund Chaderton's and Lovell's appointments uncertain, and supposes the keepership of the jewels to have been detached on the latter occasion. But it was clearly on the former, the date of

of the Household in August 1592, he was succeeded by John, afterwards Sir John, Heron, who had in fact acted as his assistant and kept his books from 1487.[1] Under the Tudors, with their general tendency to elaborate the personal control of government by the sovereign, the post remained one of first-class importance. It was regulated in 1511 by a statute, the recital of which sets out that it had been the practice for certain Receivers of royal lands to account before persons appointed by Henry VII 'for the more speedy payment of his revenues and the accounts of the same to be more speedily taken than could have been after the course of the Exchequer', and after accounting to pay sums to the use of the King in his chamber.[2] The record of these transactions, signed by the King or 'his trusty servant John Heron' had been no legal discharge to the accountants in the Exchequer. Henry VIII had set up by patent a body of General Surveyors and Approvers of the King's Lands to take the accounts, and the statute confirms this proceeding and appoints John Heron to be Treasurer of the Chamber, and to be answerable, with his successors, direct to the King, and not to the Exchequer.[3] John Heron continued in office until 1521.[4] His successor

which is given in *C. P. R., 1 Rich. III*, p. 5, m. 21, as 26 Apr. 1484. Lovell is described as Treasurer of the King's Chamber on 26 Feb. 1486 and of the Queen's Chamber about the following Easter (Campbell, i. 228, 316). There is no patent for him, and my impression is that both posts had been annexed to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, granted him on 12 Oct. 1485 (*C. P. R., 1 Hen. VII*, p. 1, m. 18).

[1] Newton, 354, with a full account of Heron's career.

[2] This arrangement had already been legalized by *1 Hen. VIII*, c. 3 (*Statutes*, iii. 2), which authorizes the payment of certain revenues to Heron as General Receiver, 'and to other persons . . . hereafter in like office to be deputed and assigned as in the time of the late . . . King Henry the vijth hath been used', but does not refer to him as Treasurer of the Chamber.

[3] *3 Hen. VIII*, c. 23 (*Statutes*, iii. 45). It is provided by § 6 'that the Kinges forenamed trusty servant John Heron be from hensfurth Tresourer of the Kinges Chamber, and that he by the name of Tresourer of the Kinges Chambre be named accepted and called; and that he and every other persone whom the King hereaftur shall name and appoint to the said roome or office of Tresourer of his Chamber be not Charged ne chargeable for any suche his or their Receipt of any parte or parcell of the premisses as before ys expressed or therefor to accompte answere or make repayment to any persone or persones other then to the King or his heires in his or their Chamber, and not in the said Eschequier'. The Act only had force to 30 Nov. 1512, but it was continued by *4 Hen. VIII*, c. 18, *6 Hen. VIII*, c. 24, *7 Hen. VIII*, c. 7, *14–15 Hen. VIII*, c. 15, and made permanent by *27 Hen. VIII*, c. 62 in 1535 (*Statutes*, iii. 68, 145, 182, 219, 631). The account of this legislation in Newton, 361, treats the Act of *6 Hen. VIII* as its starting-point.

[4] His salary was at first £10, afterwards £25 a quarter (Brewer, iii. 407). He died on 10 June 1522 (Newton, 358).

was John Miklowe, who had been Comptroller of the Household.[1] But Miklowe's tenure of office must have been short, for in 1523 a statute, passed in renewal of that of 1511, names as Treasurer Sir Henry Wyatt, who was the father of the poet, Sir Thomas Wyatt.[2] In 1526 Wyatt was placed on the Privy Council[3]; and on 13 April 1528 he was succeeded as Treasurer by Sir Brian Tuke, who held office until 1545.[4] In 1541 a new statute was passed which erected the Surveyors of the King's Lands into a court of record, appointed the Treasurer of the Chamber as Treasurer of the Court, and required him to account before the Court or such other persons as the King might appoint, both in this capacity and also for 'all and every the receytes issues profyttes dettes and thinges concernyng his office of Treasurership of the Kinges Chamber'.[5] Tuke was succeeded on 25 November 1545 by Sir Anthony Rous, to whom one John Dawes acted as deputy[6]; and Rous on 19 February 1546, by Sir William Cavendish, to the disappointment of Stephen Vaughan, Henry's financial agent at Antwerp, who had hoped for the post. Cavendish also had the assistance of a deputy, Robert Oliver.[7] During Cavendish's tenure of office, two further changes in the position of the Treasurership took place. A patent of 1547, subsequently confirmed by statute under

[1] A letter in Brewer, iii. 781 (N.D. but dated by Brewer 2 Dec. 1521), speaks of 'Master Myclo the new treasurer in Master Heron is room'. Certain payments were made by John Myklowe, 'late treasurer of the King's chamber', from 1 June 1521 to 1 May 1522, and thereafter by Edmund Peckham (Brewer, iii. 1156), until 1 Jan. 1523. Conceivably Peckham, who had been a clerk in the counting-house, and was cofferer by 1524 (Brewer, iv. 422), may have been Treasurer for a short period between Miklowe and Wyatt, unless indeed these payments belong to a special war loan or subsidy account, such as Wyatt himself rendered in 1524 (Brewer, iv. 82), probably not strictly in his capacity as Treasurer of the Chamber. Miklowe is described as Treasurer on 10 Apr. 1522 and was dead by 28 June 1522 (Brewer, iii. 924, 998). For his earlier history, cf. Brewer, ii. 436; iii. 332; xxi. 2. 426; Ellis, iii. 3, 271.

[2] Wyatt is described as Treasurer in an indenture of 18 Feb. 1523 (Brewer, iii. 1190). In one of Cavendish's memoranda as printed in *Trevelyan Papers*, ii. 12, the name of Sir Thomas has been substituted for that of Sir Henry as a predecessor of Cavendish. This is an error, or more probably a forgery, as Collier edited the volume, and called special attention to the entry. Sir Thomas Wyatt was riding in 1524 on war loan business, payment for which is in his father's account (Brewer, iv. 85). On 21 Oct. 1524 he became clerk of the jewels. It is just possible that the old connexion of the Treasurer with the Jewel House suggested the confusion, on which cf. Simonds, *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 19.

[3] *H. O.* 159.

[4] Brewer, iv. 1843.

[5] *33 Hen. VIII*, c. 39 (*Statutes*, iii. 879).

[6] Brewer, xx. 2. 452; Dasent, i. 323, 470.

[7] Brewer, xxi. 1. 125, 147; *Trevelyan Papers*, i. 197.

Edward VI in 1553, dissolved alike the Court of Surveyors and the analogous Court of Augmentations, created to deal with the revenues of surrendered religious houses in 1535, and established in place of these a combined Court of Augmentation and Revenues of the King's Crown, of which the Treasurer of the Chamber was to continue to act as Treasurer.[1] Hardly, however, had this readjustment received legislative sanction, when it was upset again. A patent of 1554, under the authority of an Act of Mary's first Parliament, suppressed the Court of Augmentation, by annexing its business to the Exchequer, and directed the revenues to be paid into the Exchequer and accounts to be audited there, as before the Court was set up.[2] Cavendish did not find the Treasurership a bed of roses. On Tuke's death it was anticipated that his successor would receive a legacy of official debts.[3] A book containing copies of 'certificates' or reports made by Cavendish to the Privy Council show that he soon had occasion to be perturbed.[4] About Lady Day 1546 he represented that his receipts had been dislocated to the extent of about £14,000, and that in view of his liabilities, which he detailed, there was urgent need to consider the state of the office. In another paper he called attention to the enormous number of securities for old debts to the Crown, some of them dating from the time of Henry VII, with which he found from Tuke's books that he was charged; and, as 'a yonge officer not long exercised in the same', prayed that these might be reviewed, and a decision arrived at as to how much of the total nominal amount of £322,980 covered by them stood for 'sperat' and how much for 'desperat' debts. The book also contains summaries of his liabilities during 1547, at the end of 1548, when he declared that he had debts of £14,000 and no ready money in the office, and finally at Lady Day 1554. This last item does not disclose how far his revenue had in the interval been made sufficient for his needs. It is possible that it had been made more than sufficient, for on 17 August 1556 the Privy Council called upon him to appear before them with 'Cade his clerc', and on 9 October 1557 they returned his book of account, stating that he owed £5,237 5*s.* 0¾*d.* and

[1] 7 *Edw. VI*, c. 2 (*Statutes*, iv. 1, 164).

[2] 1 *Mary*, Sess. 2, c. 10 (*Statutes*, iv. 1, 208); Thomas, 15.

[3] Wriothesley to Paget in Brewer, xx. 2. 338 (5 Nov. 1545). A later letter of 11 Nov. (Brewer, xx. 2. 365) refers to debts of the Surveyors' Court 'which is the Chamber'. In 1552 Charles Tuke was called on by the Privy Council to bring his father's accounts to the Lord Chamberlain for view and consideration (Dasent, iv. 164).

[4] *Trevelyan Papers*, ii. 1. The book is now in the R. O. It is in the statement of 1548 that Sir T. Wyatt's name has been inserted.

must appear and answer particularities, either in person or, if ill, by his clerks.[1] It seems clear that the Tudor period had seen a very considerable increase in the scope of the financial transactions with which the Treasurer of the Chamber had to deal. In addition to privy purse expenditure in the narrower sense, such as the royal pocket-money, alms and oblations, largesse and rewards, and the like, he became responsible for many wages and annuities, some of which, including those of the royal players, had formerly been charged direct upon the Exchequer.[2] He purchased the jewels and costly stuffs in which much of the Tudor wealth was invested. He financed or helped to finance the Surveyor of Works, the Great Wardrobe, and even for a time the Cofferer of the Household. And beyond the limits of anything which could be called domestic expenditure, he undertook much that was concerned with 'the King's outward causes', the maintenance of posts and ambassadors, royal loans, secret service; even, it would appear, although perhaps out of a special account, the service of war. His income, originally derived from the Exchequer, was put on to an independent basis, by the direct assignment to him of numerous revenues, both ordinary and extraordinary, including most of the new sources of wealth on which the financial policy of Henry VII had firmly based the power of the Crown. Some of his payments were made in accordance with old established custom or under household ordinances or other standing instructions.[3] But the great majority depended upon the personal authority of the sovereign, communicated either by word of mouth or by warrant under the sign manual or the signet, or in course of time through the medium of a minister such as Wolsey or the Privy Council. Similarly he rendered his accounts at first to the King in person, and the early books bear the signatures of Henry VII and Henry VIII in token of audit on many pages.[4] The responsibility grew to be a very heavy one, with a turnover of some £100,000 in the course of a year, and we find Brian Tuke in 1534 writing of it as 'a charge that far surmounteth any in England', and pressing 'that for things ordinary I may have for payments an ordinary warrant, and that for things extraordinary I may always have special warrant or else some such way as I, dealing truly, may be truly discharged', lest if there were any misunderstanding, 'I might be undone in a day, lacking any warrant when I sue for it'. It would

[1] Dasent, v. 329; vi. 182; *Hatfield MSS.* i. 256.
[2] Cf. ch. xiii (Interluders).
[3] Examples are in *H. O.* 120, 139, 147.
[4] Cf. App. B.

appear to have been the special difficulty of the Treasurer's position which led to the system of audit by means of a 'Declared Account', as a substitute at once for the cumbrous method of the earlier Exchequer, and the more recent practice of personal verification by the sovereign. When Sir Henry Wyatt left office he was directed to declare his account before a General Surveyor of the King's Lands, and this method was adopted when the Surveyors became a statutory court in 1541 and ultimately passed after the dissolution of the special courts into ordinary Exchequer practice.[1]

Sir William Cavendish, who was ill when the Privy Council asked for details of his account on 9 October, died on 25 October 1557. An account for 1 April to 31 December 1557 is in the name of Edmund Felton, perhaps only an *interim* administrator.[2] The Treasurership of the Chamber, together with the Mastership of the Posts, was granted by patent on 29 October 1558 to Sir John Mason, with a fee of £240 and 1*s*. a day.[3] Mason was continued in office by Elizabeth, and on 23 December 1558 the Lord Chamberlain, the Comptroller of the Household, the Secretary, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were appointed as a committee of the Privy Council 'to survey the office of the Treasurer of the Chamber and to assigne order of paymente'.[4] As a result, considerable changes seem to have been made, which reversed the policy of the last half-century and much reduced the Treasurer's responsibilities. On the one hand, the funds assigned to the Cofferer of the Household, the Surveyor of Works, the Master of Posts, and the Ambassadors no longer passed through his account; on the other, a separate account was established for the more personal expenditure of the Queen, which was put into the charge of a Groom of the Privy Chamber, acting as keeper of the Privy Purse. Both accounts seem to have become subject to audit and declaration at the Exchequer; but while that of the Treasurer of the Chamber was declared annually, the only extant Privy Purse account of the reign is one for the ten years 1559-69 declared after the death of the first keeper, John Tamworth.[5] This was

[1] A fuller account of the Tudor Chamber finance is given by Newton, 360; cf. M. D. George, *The Origin of the Declared Account* (*E. H. R.* xxxi. 41). [2] Felton was cofferer in 1553 (*Archaeologia*, xii. 372).

[3] *S. P. D. Mary*, xiv. The fee of £240 represents the old fee of £100 attached to the Treasurership, together with allowances of £100 for board wages, £20 for clerks, £10 for boat-hire, and £10 for office necessaries, which Cavendish's accounts show that he enjoyed. The 1*s*. a day was presumably the fee for the Posts.

[4] Dasent, vii. 15, 27; *S. P. D. Eliz. Addl.* ix. 3.

[5] Nicholas, *Eliz.* i. 264, printed the accounts of Edmund Downing as

a small account, mainly fed by New Year and other gifts to the Queen. The expenditure out of it only averaged about £2,500 a year. Most of it was upon gifts and rewards, which were detailed in a book of particulars under the sign manual, unfortunately not preserved. A payment of £5,000 to the Earl of Moray suggests that it proved a convenient channel for secret service funds. It also includes items for the keep of the royal fool, for the purchase of jewels, and for certain annuities, wages, riding charges, and expenses of the stable and hunt. The Treasurer of the Chamber, under the new arrangement, spent about £12,000 a year.[1] Out of this he defrayed the royal alms, certain rewards, wages, annuities, and riding charges, the maintenance of prisoners, and the expenses of 'apparelling' the Queen's houses and keeping her gardens. Obviously the two accounts come very near overlapping at several points. One may suppose that in the main the Treasurer of the Chamber was responsible for customary payments and such as could be made on the authority of officers of state or household; the Keeper of the Privy Purse with those which depended on the personal pleasure of the sovereign. The officers borne on the Treasurer of the Chamber's wage list were those who belonged neither to the household proper nor to the 'standing' offices; the Yeomen of the Guard, the Watermen, the Apothecaries, the Musicians and Players, the Hunt, the Footmen and Boys of the Stable, the Artificers, the Rat and Mole Takers, the Keepers of Paris Garden, the Surveyor of Gates and Bridges, the Chester Post. That they should also have included the officers of the Jewel House is explicable from the original connexion between these and the Treasurer. The Treasurer's own salary and his office expenses also appear in his account.

executor to John Tamworth for 1559–69 from the audited copy in *Harleian Rolls*, A. A. 23. Copies are also in the *Pipe Office Declared Accounts*, 2791, and the *Audit Office Declared Accounts*, 2021, 1. No later Elizabethan Privy Purse Accounts are known, but it appears from the lists of New Year gifts for 1561, 1578, 1579, 1589, and 1600 (Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 108; ii. 65, 249; iii. 1, 445) that Henry Sackford succeeded John Tamworth as custodian of gifts given in cash, and he is described as Keeper at Elizabeth's death (*S. P. D. Jac. I*, vi. 2). His successor was Sir George Home, afterwards (1605) Earl of Dunbar (*S. P. D. Docquet* of 17 May 1603). Jacobean accounts for 1603–5 are in *Pipe Office Declared Accounts*, 2792, and in *Audit Office Declared Accounts*, 2021. Some extracts are in Cunningham, xviii. In 1617 (*Abstract*, 6) the Privy Purse disposed of £5,000 and an additional £1,100 from New Year gifts.

[1] This estimate is based on the account for 1594–5; doubtless there was some variation from year to year. A memorandum of *c.* 1596 (*Hatfield MSS.* vi. 571) gives the annual assignment to the office by warrant dormant as £13,800.

The distinction now drawn between the Treasury of the Chamber and the Privy Purse must have had the effect of putting the Treasurer in a position analogous to that of the Secretaries. He was on the way to becoming an officer of state rather than an officer of the household.

The order of payment determined upon by the Privy Council appears to have been that salaries chargeable to the Treasurer of the Chamber should be payable upon 'warrants dormant', 'riding charges' for messengers upon warrants from the Secretary, and miscellaneous payments, such as rewards for plays at court, upon warrants from the Privy Council itself.[1] Sir Francis Knollys became Treasurer of the Chamber when Mason died upon 21 April 1566[2]; and Thomas, afterwards Sir Thomas, Heneage, when Knollys was appointed Treasurer of the Household, on 15 February 1570.[3] Knollys, throughout his period of office, and Heneage, from 1589, combined the Treasurership with the duties of Vice-Chamberlain of the Household. Heneage died in October 1595, and there was some delay before a successor was appointed.[4] A trial of strength seems to have taken place between Essex and Burghley, who regarded the filling of the vacancy, together with the much more important vacancy in the Secretaryship, as critical to his chances of prolonging his dynasty. Burghley's candidate was John Stanhope; Essex's Sir Henry Unton, to whom he wrote about his prospects on 24 October 1595, telling him that Robert Cecil was troubled at the competition, and thought that neither would carry it.[5] I am not sure that Cecil had been quite straightforward with Essex. Another aspirant was Sir Edward Wotton.[6] There is gossip about the matter in Rowland Whyte's letters to Sir Robert Sidney.[7] On 29 October he wrote, 'Probi is comanded to

[1] On 23 July 1581 Heneage wrote to Hatton (Hatton, 181) that he could only grant allowances to couriers sent to Mr. Secretary in France if signed for by the Lord Treasurer, Lord Chamberlain, or Vice-Chamberlain. On 26 May 1590 (*Cecil Papers*, iv. 35) a royal warrant directed Heneage to pay on warrants subscribed by Burghley, as formerly by Walsingham. Both documents refer to temporary arrangements in the absence of a Secretary. When Herbert became Second Secretary in 1600, it was 'doubted that his warrants for money matters will be of no force to the Treasurer of the Chamber, which office depends upon the principal Secretary's warrants' (*Sydney Papers*, ii. 194).

[2] Camden (tr.), 130; Haynes-Murdin, ii. 761; *S. P. D. Eliz.* xl. 20.

[3] Wright, *Eliz.* i. 355; Hatton, 39; Heneage's accounts begin on 15 Feb. 1570.

[4] Camden (tr.), 450; Dasent, xxv. 4.

[5] *Cecil Papers*, iv. 68.

[6] *D. N. B.* from *Lansd. MS.* lxxix, No. 19.

[7] *Sydney Papers*, i. 356, 357, 363, 373, 382.

wayt at court; hath spoken with her Majestie, and is sayd he shall haue the Disbursing of the Treasory of the Chamber, till her Majestie be pleased to bestow yt. Sir H. Umpton and Mr. John Stanhope, stands for yt.' On 5 November, 'Peter Proby paies the money till a Treasorer of the Chamber be chosen, which will not be in hast'. Peter Proby was a useful hanger-on of Burghley's, and had been his barber. On 20 November 'Sir Thomas Heneges Funerals were solemnised, his Offices all vnbestowed'. By 7 December Whyte ventures a prophecy:

'I heare that Mr. Killigrew shall receve and pay the Treasure of the Chamber, till the Queen find one fitt for it; but if this continew true, Mr. Killigrew will haue it in the End himself.'

Whyte was wrong, however. William Killigrew was a mere stop-gap.[1] On 20 December, Whyte has an inkling of what is going on, and commits his new information to cipher.

'The Queen hath promised him [Sir H. Unton] the Thresureship of the Chamber, and stands constant in it, and at his return to haue it. But if 900 [Burghley] and 200 [Cecil], that would 40 [Stanhope] had it, can hinder it, the other shall goe without it.'

It was not until 5 July that, according to an amused letter from Anthony Bacon, 'Elephas peperit' with the swearing in of Sir Robert Cecil as Secretary and John Stanhope as Treasurer of the Chamber, 'so that now the old man may say with the rich man in the gospel *requiescat anima mea*'.

Burghley himself notes the appointment without comment in his diary.[2] John Stanhope, who was knighted on his appointment and created Lord Stanhope of Harrington on 4 May 1605, did not get the Vice-Chamberlainship until 1601. He remained Treasurer until his death in 1617. There was some characteristic Stuart traffic in the reversion. Sir Thomas Overbury held it at his death in 1613. Lord Rochester then bought it from Stanhope for £2,000, and offered it to Sir Henry Neville, who declined to take it from a subject. Finally it passed to Sir William Uvedale, who in fact became Treasurer in succession to Stanhope.[3]

During Stanhope's tenure of office, some changes in the 'order of payment' took place. The account for 1607–8 recites a privy seal of 27 January 1608 as authority for the transfer from the Privy Purse to the Treasurer of the Chamber

[1] *Cecil Papers*, v. 500; Haynes-Murdin, ii. 808. Killigrew rendered an account from 16 Dec. 1595 to 3 July 1596.
[2] Birch, *Eliz.* ii. 61; Haynes-Murdin, ii. 809.
[3] Birch, *James*, i. 277; *S. P. D. Jac. I*, lxxxi. 15.

of certain payments made on warrants from the Lord Chamberlain. Similar payments thereafter form a regular section of the account from year to year. By a later privy seal of 11 October 1614, still extant, an additional sum of £1,500 a year is put at the disposal of the Treasurer to enable him to meet them.[1] His total assignment was thus increased to about £20,000 or rather more than half as much again as the office had cost under Elizabeth. That of the Privy Purse was now about £6,000.[2] We have seen that there had been possibilities of overlapping between the two accounts, but it is rather odd that amongst the items transferred should be specified allowances for plays, bear-baitings and other sports, since such allowances had regularly been paid by the Treasurer of the Chamber for something more than a century past. It is, however, the case that from 1614–15 onwards, the payments were made on warrants from the Lord Chamberlain instead of the Privy Council.

It is rather surprising that the Privy Council, whose members were carrying out duties roughly analogous to those of a modern Cabinet, should at any time have concerned itself with such trifling matters of domestic routine as the signature of certificates authorizing the payment of rewards at recognized rates to companies of actors and other entertainers. The explanation, however, is that the Privy Council, like the Household and the Departments of State themselves, was a direct representative of the Norman *curia regis*, and that the *curia regis* had been the organization through which the King's subjects and servants gave him assistance in all his affairs, small and great, domestic as well as political.[3] For all practical purposes, indeed, the Elizabethan Privy Council consisted of little more than the chief officers of the State departments and Household, sitting together, and acting collectively. The great territorial magnates, who at certain periods of its history had turned it into an instrument for the control rather than the exercise of the royal prerogative,

[1] *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, v. 81–3. The recital runs: 'Whereas we have thought fitt to disburden our privy purse of certaine paymentes used of late to be made out of it, And to assigne the said paymentes to be henceforth made by you our Tr*easure*r of our Chamber . . . for allowances to players, for playes made before vs, for bullbayting, beare-bayting, and anie other sport shewed vnto vs.' The Treasurer is to pay 'vpon billes rated allowed and subscribed by our Chamberlaine'. Warrants for rewards for plays were still signed by the Privy Council during 1608–14, but by the Chamberlain from 1614.

[2] *Abstract*, 7, 12. During 1603–17 the Treasurer of the Chamber had also had £21,362 for 'extraordinary disbursements'.

[3] The development has been fully worked out by Professor Baldwin.

were now, unless they happened to hold official positions, rarely sworn amongst its members; but upon it, side by side with the Chancellor and the Treasurer, the Admiral and the Privy Seal, sat not only the Secretaries, but also the Steward and the Chamberlain, the Master of the Horse, the Treasurer and Comptroller of the Household, and often the Vice-Chamberlain or the Treasurer of the Chamber. It was therefore natural enough, to Tudor no less than to mediaeval ways of thinking, that among its numerous and imperfectly defined activities should be included some which give it the aspect of a Household board of control. It was in fact by means of a Household ordinance that Henry VIII regulated the composition of the Privy Council and directed the constant attendance of the members upon his own person[1]; and throughout Elizabeth's reign we find the Council in the closest possible association with the Court, following it from palace to palace, and even from stage to stage of the progress, so that the record of its meetings serves practically as a royal itinerary, and sitting under the most direct Household influences in some convenient apartment of the Privy Chamber. There was even no longer, as in the time of Henry VIII, a 'council at London' as well as a 'council with the King', with the exceptions that, if the Court was very far from head-quarters, a few of the lords sometimes stayed behind to look after current affairs, and that the council as a whole seems occasionally to have met at Westminster when the Court was not there, either in connexion with the sittings of the Star Chamber, or for special business in the lodgings of one or other of its members.[2] This tradition of propinquity between the Sovereign and his council was, however, broken through by James, who at an early date in his reign took to leaving the lords to transact business at court, while he went hither and thither on his endless hunting journeys.

In the absence of any contemporary *ordinale* for the Privy Council, some idea of its methods can be gathered from the register of transactions kept by its clerks and from other sources.[3] It is probable that the Queen sometimes sat with

[1] *H. O.* 159 (1526).

[2] Cheyney, i. 67, 106; Hornemann, 52; Dasent, *passim*. Certain regulations called Orders in Star Chamber (cf. App. D, No. cxx) appear to proceed from the Council sitting in the Star Chamber, but in an administrative, not a judicial, capacity.

[3] Cf. generally for this paragraph Cheyney, i. 65; Hornemann, 19, 49; E. R. Adair, *The Privy Council Registers* (*E. H. R.* xxx. 698); and prefaces to Dasent, *passim*.

the lords, although her attendance is never recorded in the register.[1] The usual president was the Lord Chancellor; the earlier Tudor post of President of the Council was rarely, if ever, filled up by Elizabeth.[2] But the general supervision of the clerks and the preparation of business for consideration, other than that which lay directly within the department of some particular officer, seems to have fallen to the Secretary. The number of councillors was gradually reduced from twenty-four at the beginning to thirteen at the end of the reign. Of these not more than half were generally present at any one sitting. But there appears to have been no fixed quorum; occasionally only two members or even one transacted business. At first three meetings a week sufficed; later they were often held daily, both by morning and afternoon, and even on Sundays. Wednesday and Friday were generally set aside for petitions and other private business, and the remaining days devoted to public affairs. Drafts of proclamations were passed by the Council before they received the royal sign manual, and thus became of the nature of Orders in Council.[3] Where a proclamation was not in question, the conclusions arrived at by the Council were embodied in a minute, and submitted through the Secretary for royal approval. When this had been obtained, any executive action was then taken in the form of warrants or letters to administrative officers, central or local, or to individuals, according to the nature of the business. These required the signature of not less than six councillors, who were not necessarily those present when the business was discussed. Before they were put forward for signature they were subscribed by the Secretary or one of the clerks. Warrants to the Treasurer of the Chamber or other paymasters were also impressed by the clerk with the special seal of the council. The minutes were ultimately placed in the council chest, which is unfortunately lost. But copies or abstracts of those which related to public affairs, or in some cases copies of the letters finally issued, were made by the clerks and from time to time bound up in volumes, of which a series, far from

[1] La Mothe, iv. 29 (22 March 1571): 'J'y suys arrivé sur le poinct que ceux de son conseil venoient de débattre, devant elle, les poinctz du tretté.'

[2] Hornemann, 54, cites *S. P. D. Eliz.* cclxxviii. 55 as evidence that Essex was President of the Council; but surely it was the Council in Ireland. Scaramelli (*V. P.* ix. 567) reports an interview with the Council on 24 Apr. 1603, at which he says the Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Council, was not present. This suggests that James had appointed a President. 'These Lords of the Council', adds Scaramelli, 'behave like so many kings.'

[3] Steele, xiv.

continuous, is preserved.[1] Even at their fullest, however, these 'Acts of the Council' cannot be supposed to form a complete record of its proceedings. Council letters are to be found in many local archives of which no note exists in the register. There were four or five Clerks of the Council who took duty, two at a time, according to a monthly rota, and it is clear that some of them were more business-like than others. But it is also probable that much business of a confidential character was deliberately left without record. In addition to the clerks, there was a Keeper of the Council Chamber door, probably one of the Ushers of the Chamber, and the Messengers of the Chamber were available to carry such letters as could not conveniently be entrusted to the regular staff of the Master of Posts.[2]

The ordinary sittings of the Privy Council were of course held in private, and each member took a special oath of secrecy upon appointment. But on each Wednesday and Friday during term time they resolved themselves into the Court of Star Chamber, and held a public sitting to inquire into cases of riot, libel, disregard of proclamations, and the like. Herein they were exercising the old power of the *curia regis* to duplicate the functions of the law courts.[3] For Star Chamber purposes they associated with themselves judges, who ranked as 'ordinary' but not 'privy' councillors.[4] 'Ordinary' councillors also were the Queen's 'counsel learned in the law', who included the Attorney- and Solicitor-Generals and the Queen's Serjeants, and the Masters of Requests who, by another exercise of curial jurisdiction, sat in the old 'white hall' at Westminster to deal, under the general direction of the Privy Council, with civil cases arising out of the suits of poor men or of royal servants.[5] The political functions of the Privy Council lie beyond the scope of this study, but their concern with all matters affecting breach of the peace, sedition, heresy, and public health entailed, under more than one of these heads, a general supervision of the stage, which

[1] Cf. App. D, *Bibl. Note.*

[2] Robert Laneham was Keeper and describes his functions (Laneham, 59): 'Noow, syr, if the Councell sit, I am at hand, wait at an inch, I warrant yoo. If any make babling, "peas!" (say I) "woot ye whear ye ar?" if I take a lystenar, or a priar in at the chinks or at the lokhole, I am by & by in the bones of him; but now they keep good order; they kno me well inough: If a be a freend, or such one az I lyke, I make him sit dooun by me on a foorm, or a cheast: let the rest walk, a God's name!'

[3] Baldwin, 439; Cheyney, i. 81; Dicey, 68, 94.

[4] Baldwin, 450; Percy, 17.

[5] Cheyney, i. 109; Percy, 48.

will be the subject for discussion in a later chapter.[1] Similarly, the players, or those of them who were royal servants, came as such under the jurisdiction of the Court of Requests, and some interesting information as to their contracts and disputes is derived from the records of that tribunal.[2]

[1] Cf. ch. ix.

[2] Cf. chh. xiii (Pembroke's, Worcester's), xvi (Theatre, Globe), xvii (Blackfriars).

III

THE REVELS OFFICE

[Sixteenth-century material is collected by A. Feuillerat, *Documents relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth* (1908, *Materialien*, xxi), and *Documents relating to the Office of Revels in the Time of Edward VI and Mary* (1914, *Materialien*, xliv), which replace the extracts from Sir Thomas Cawarden's papers in A. J. Kempe, *The Loseley Manuscripts* (1835), and the report by J. C. Jeaffreson in *Hist. MSS.* vii. 596 (1879), the Audit Office records in P. Cunningham, *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court* (1842), and Sir Henry Herbert's copies of official papers in J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *A Collection of Ancient Documents respecting the Office of Master of the Revels* (1870, cited from its running title as *Dramatic Records*). A study of the documents is contained in A. Feuillerat, *Le Bureau des Menus-Plaisirs et la Mise en Scène à la Cour d'Elizabeth* (1910). Much of my own *Notes on the History of the Revels Office under the Tudors* (1906) is incorporated in the present chapter. Cunningham's book is still useful for the seventeenth century; the authenticity of some of his documents is discussed in Appendix B. Of earlier historians of the stage, George Chalmers, *Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers* (1797), deals most fully with the Revels Office; it is matter for regret that Sir George Buck's 'particular commentary' of the 'Art of Revels' has disappeared. In his *Supplementary Apology* (1799) Chalmers made many extracts from the office books, now apparently lost, of Sir Henry Herbert (1623–73). Others had already been published by Malone (*Variorum*, iii). These have now been collected with other material, including the later documents from *Dramatic Records*, in J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert* (1917, cited as Herbert).]

One of the 'standing' offices which, from the general oversight exercised over them by the Lord Chamberlain, may also be regarded as 'offices outward of the Chamber' was the Revels Office. This, in its fullest establishment, consisted of a Master, a Clerk Comptroller, and a Clerk, whose services it shared with the analogous Office of Tents, a Yeoman, and a Groom. It was of Tudor origin. The first mention of a Master of Revels is in a Household order of 31 December 1494.[1] But the post appears to have been at this period a purely temporary one, conferred upon some existing officer of the Household, who had been selected to supervise and defray the expenses of the revels for a particular feast. Several of these *ad hoc* Masters are recorded at the court of Henry VIII; the most prominent was Sir Henry Guildford,

[1] *Order for Sitting in the King's Great Chamber* (*H. O.* 113): 'If the master of revells be there, he may sitt with the chapleyns or with the esquires or gentlemen ushers.'

who held various offices, including that of Comptroller of the Household. The Masters appear to be distinct from the Lords of Misrule, who were also appointed *pro hac vice* during the Christmas season, but whose duties were ceremonial and quasi-dramatic, rather than administrative.[1] In dealing with the details of Revels organization, the transitory and fluctuating Masters had, from the beginning of the reign, the assistance of a permanent official, who belonged originally to the establishment of the Wardrobe. It was his business to carry into effect the general directions of the Master; to obtain stuffs from mercers or from the Wardrobe itself, and ornaments from the Jewel House and the Mint; to engage architects, carpenters, painters, tailors and embroiderers; to superintend the actual performances in the banqueting-hall or the tilt-yard, and attempt to preserve the costly and elaborate pageants from the rifling of the guests; to have the custody of dresses, visors, and properties; and finally, to render accounts and obtain payment for expenses from the Exchequer. These duties, with others of like character, were long performed by one Richard Gibson, whose careful accounts, compiled in an execrable orthography, preserve many curious details of forgotten pageantries, including the employment of none other than Hans Holbein in the decoration of a banqueting-hall at Greenwich. Gibson had a double qualification for his functions. In addition to his office as Porter and Yeoman Tailor of the Wardrobe, he had been, as far back as 1494, one of the King's players.[2] He had apparently the art of making himself indispensable, for he gradually accumulated both posts and pensions. He held the ancient office of Pavilionary or Serjeant of Tents, and in this capacity made the arrangements for the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. By 1526 he was one of the royal Serjeants-at-Arms.[3] Machyn, who records the burning of his son for heresy at Smithfield in 1557, describes him as 'sergantt Gybsun, sergantt of armes, and of the reywelles, and of the kynges tenstes'.[4] It is not, however, clear that he held a distinct post as Serjeant of Revels, and when a patent was issued to his successor, John Farlyon, in 1534, it was not as Serjeant, but only as Yeoman.[5] Farlyon also became in course of time Serjeant of Tents, and the traditional connexion between Tents and Revels was never wholly broken.

[1] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 404. [2] Cf. ch. xiii.

[3] Brewer, i. 24, 283, 690, 828; ii. 875, 1044, 1479; iii. 129; iv. 868; cf. *Tudor Revels*, 6.

[4] Machyn, 157.

[5] Brewer, vii. 560; Feuillerat, *M. P.* 22; cf. *Tudor Revels*, 7.

Whether John Travers, who became Serjeant of Tents on Farlyon's death in 1539, had any supervision over John Bridges, who became Yeoman of Revels, is rather doubtful.[1] But the position becomes quite clear in 1545, when the Serjeantship of Tents was converted into a Mastership, and its holder, Sir Thomas Cawarden, was also appointed, under a separate patent of 11 March 1545, to an entirely new post as a permanent Master of the Revels, to whom the Yeoman naturally became subordinate.[2] This continued to be John Bridges until 1550, when he was succeeded by John Holt, who had acted as his deputy since 1547.[3] Cawarden enlarged the establishment by securing the appointment of a Clerk Comptroller to check and of a Clerk to keep the books, thus leaving the Yeoman free to devote himself to the practical side of the business.[4] Both these officers served, and continued throughout our period to serve, alike for the Tents and the Revels. John Barnard was Clerk Comptroller from 1545 to 1550, when he was succeeded by Richard Lees.[5] The first Clerk was Thomas Philipps, who was appointed in 1546, and held his post until 1560.[6] But from 1551 most of the duties were performed by a deputy, Thomas Blagrave, who succeeded to the Clerkship on 25 March 1560.[7] Blagrave was a personal 'servant' of Cawarden, who probably saw to it that all the subordinate officers appointed after the retirement of Bridges were his own nominees. Each, however, held his post under a patent direct from the Crown, and this arrangement bore the promise of administrative complications when the personal relation with the Master had terminated. The following document illustrates the organization of the office as settled by Cawarden about 1546:[8]

[1] Brewer, xiv. 1. 574; 2. 102, 159.

[2] Patent in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 53. The appointment was retrospective from 16 March 1544. Cawarden had taken an inventory of Revels stuff for the King as far back as 10 Dec. 1542 (Feuillerat, *M. P.* 27). The historical memorandum of 1573 (cf. p. 82) printed in *Tudor Revels*, 2, says, 'After the deathe of Travers Seriaunt of the said office, Sir Thomas Carden knight, beinge of the kinges maiesties pryvie Chamber, beinge skilfull and delightinge in matters of devise, preferred to that office, did mislyke to be tearmed a Seriaunt because of his better countenaunce of roome and place beinge of the kinges maiesties privye Chamber. And so became he by patent the first master of the Revelles.'

[3] Patent in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 70; cf. Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 4, 9.

[4] *Tudor Revels*, 2, from memorandum of 1573.

[5] Brewer, xx. 1. 213; Feuillerat, *M. P.* 28; *Edw. and M.* 49; Patent to Lees in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 56.

[6] Patent in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 66.

[7] Patent in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 68; cf. *Edw. and M.* 74, 180, 272. Blagrave is described as Cawarden's 'servant' in 1546–7, and again in Cawarden's will of 1559. He was aged about 50 on 27 June 1572 (*M. S. C.* ii. 52).

[8] Kempe, 93.

Constitucions howe the King's Revells ought to be usyd :

Fyrst, an Invyntory to be made by the Clarke controwler and Clarke, by the Survey and apowentinge of the mastyr of the Revells, Aswell of all and singular masking garments with all thear furnyture, as allso of all bards for horsis, coveryng of bards and bassis of all kynds, with all and singular the appurtenances, which Invytory, subscribyd by the yoman and clarke, ought to remayne in the custody of the Master of the Offyces and the goodes for the saeffe kepyng.

Item, that no kynd of stuff be bowght, but at the apowyentment of the Master or his depute Clarke controwler, being counsell therin, and that he make mencion therof, in his booke of recept which ought to be subscribyd as afforseyd by the Master.

Item, that the Clarke be privey to the cutting of all kynds of garments, and that he make mencion in his booke of thyssuing owt howe moche it takyth of all kynds to every maske, revelle, or tryumph, which boke ought to be subscrybyd as afforseyd by the Master.

Item, that the Clarke kepe check of all daye men working on the premisses, and to make two lyger boks of all wags and provisions of all kynd whate so ever, the one for the paye master and the other for the Master.

Item, that no garments forseyd, bards, coverying of bards, bassis, or suche lyck, be lent to no man without a specyall comaundment, warrant, or tokyn, from the Kyng's Maiestie, but that all be leyd up in feyr stonderds or pressis, and every presse or stonderd to have two locks a pece, with severall wards, with two keys, the one for the Master or Clarke, and the other for the yoman, so that non of them cum to the stuff without the other.

In Farlyon's time the Revels stuff had been housed at the royal mansion of Warwick Inn in the City.[1] Cawarden moved it in 1547 to the Blackfriars, where various parts of the old Priory buildings served at different times as store-rooms and work-rooms or as residences for the officers.[2] Much material bearing upon the activities of the Revels during 1544–59 is preserved at Loseley Hall, amongst the papers of Cawarden's executor, Sir William More, who also acquired his interest in the Blackfriars. Cawarden lived just long enough to superintend the festivities at Elizabeth's coronation. After his death on 29 August 1559, his offices were distributed.[3] The Mastership of the Tents was given to Henry Sackford of the Privy Chamber. Banqueting houses, however, which had originally been the concern of the Tents, seem now to have

[1] Brewer, i. 636, 757 ; ii. 179 ; xvi. 603.

[2] Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 3 ; cf. ch. xvii (Blackfriars).

[3] *Tudor Revels*, 3, from memorandum of 1573. An account of Cawarden's life by T. Craib is in *Surrey Arch. Colls.* xxviii. 7 (1915). There is a doubt as to the exact date of his death. The i.p.m. gives 29 Aug. ; his epitaph 25 Aug. Similarly the Blechingley register gives 29 Aug. for his funeral ; Machyn, 208, gives 5 Sept.

been put in charge of the Revels. The Mastership of the Revels was given, by a patent dated 18 January 1560, to Sir Thomas Benger.[1] The Clerk Comptroller and Clerk continued as in former years to be joint officers for the Tents and the Revels. Benger is a somewhat shadowy personage. It is upon record that he gave Elizabeth a ring as a New Year's gift in 1562; that the Westminster boys rehearsed the *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Miles Gloriosus* before him in 1564 and spent 6*d.* on 'pinnes and sugar candee'; that he got a licence to export 300 tons of beer in 1566; that he had players of his own at Canterbury in 1569–70; and that the corporation of Saffron Walden spent 3*s.* 6*d.* upon a 'podd' of oysters for him at Elizabeth's visit to Audley End in 1571.[2] Apparently he began his administration with good intentions. The following note is affixed to his first Revels' estimate, that for the Christmas of 1559–60:

'Memorandum, that the chargies for making of maskes cam never to so little a somme [£227 11*s.* 2*d.*] as they do this yere, for the same did ever amount, as well in the Quenes Highnes tyme that nowe is, as at all other tymes hertofore, to the somme of £400 alwaies when it was leaste.

'M^m^. also, that it may please the Quenes Ma^tie^ to appoint some of her highnes prevy Counsaile, immediatly after Shroftyde yerely, to survey the state of the saide office, to thintent it may be knowne in what case I fownd it, and how it hathe byn since used.

'M^m^. also, that the saide Counsailors may have aucthoritie to appoint suche fees of cast garments as they shall think resonable, and not the M^r^. to appoint any, as hertofore he hathe done; for I think it most for the M^rs^. savegarde so to be used.'[3]

The cast garments were a perquisite of the officers, and were sold by them, doubtless to actors. The change in the Mastership led also to a change in the local habitation of the Revels. It is to be supposed that the buildings with which Cawarden had supplemented the official storehouse were no longer available after they had passed to his executors. In any case, it is clear from the survey of 1586–7 described

[1] Patent in Rymer, xv. 565; Collier, i. 170, from privy seal; Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 54.

[2] Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 115, 280; *Athenaeum* (1903), i. 220; *3 Library*, ix. 252; Collier, i. 185. A reference to the Master of 'Revels' in *Hatfield MSS.* i. 551 is a mistake for 'Rolls'. Benger was son of Robert Benger or Berenger of Marlborough (*Harl. Soc. Visitations*, lviii. 10), was knighted 2 Oct. 1553 (Machyn, 335), and was auditor to Elizabeth as princess (Hearne, *John of Glastonbury*, 519). Further personal notes are in Stopes, *Hunnis*, 104, 311.

[3] Collier, i. 171 (assigned in error to Cawarden); Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 110, from *S. P. D. Eliz.* vii. 50.

below that upon Cawarden's death the Office of the Revels was removed to the 'late Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem' in Clerkenwell. Probably the transfer had taken place by 10 June 1560, as an inventory was drawn up on that date of 'certeyne stuff remaynynge in the Black Fryers in London'.[1] The Tents, as well as the Revels, seem to have been moved to St. John's.[2]

In accordance with Benger's request, a survey of the Revels was undertaken, under a warrant from the Privy Council of 27 April 1560, by Sir Richard Sackville and Sir Walter Mildmay, the Under Treasurer and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a draft of a document submitted to them is preserved at Loseley.[3] This contains a detailed account of the transactions of the Office since the last audit in 1555, as a result of which Cawarden's executors established a claim for a balance or 'surplusage' of £740 13*s.* 10½*d.* against the Exchequer. The total expenditure of the Office for the period covering Elizabeth's coronation and first Christmas had been £602 11*s.* 10*d.* To the account are appended inventories showing the sets of masking garments which existed in 1555, the materials since issued from the Wardrobe, the use made of both of these in the fashioning of new garments and the 'translation' of old ones, and the sets found in the Office at the time of the survey. These are marked as either 'serviceable' or 'not serviceable' or 'chargeable', but 'fees', and the warrant from the Council instructs the commissioners that cast garments 'being fees incydente to the saide office may be taken by y^e^ Master of y^e^ Revelles & dystributed in soche sorte as haue bene accostomed'. Probably the officers sold them to players.[4] No further detailed accounts are available until the last year of Benger's Mastership, but there are summaries which show an average annual expenditure of about £570.[5] For some reason, there was a great increase

[1] *Hist. MSS.* vii. 615.

[2] Lady Derby writes to Sir Christopher Hatton in 1580 that she had been with her cousin Sackford (Master of the Tents) in 'his house at St. John's' (Nicolas, *Hatton*, 148).

[3] Printed by Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 180; *Eliz.* 18, 77.

[4] Sometimes garments no longer useful for masks, but not yet cast as fees, had been altered for players, and either kept in the office and 'often used by players', or given to the players or musicians 'by composicion' or 'for their fee'. Some were missing because 'the lordes that masked toke awey parte', or they had been 'gyven awaye by the maskers in the queenes presence'. Some were treated as fees, because 'to moche knowen'; in an earlier inventory of 1555 we find 'ffees because the King hath worin hit' (Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 299; *Eliz.* 24, 25, 27, 40.

[5] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 109, 119, 124, 125, 126. Possibly the amounts of imprests are in some years to be added.

of cost in 1571–2, which is the first of a series of years for which elaborate accounts exist in the Record Office. These are of a detailed nature, much like that of Cawarden's accounts at Loseley, and arranged more or less under heads. Schedules of the plays and masks given during the periods to which they relate are in some cases attached. A brief analysis of the account for 1571–2 will show the general character of the entries. I can only dwell here upon those which relate to the organization of the Revels Office, and not upon those of merely dramatic or scenic interest. The main account runs from the end of Shrovetide, 1571, to the end of Shrovetide, 1572, and covers, firstly, a period of nine months from March to November, during which the occupation of the Office was limited to the airing and safeguard of 'stuff' and attendance upon the Master during the progress, and, secondly, an active three months of revels and preparation for revels, from December to February. This expenditure is accounted for under two main heads, *Wages and Allowances* and *Emptions and Provisions*. It may be abstracted as follows:

A. Wages and Allowances.

(i.) *March to November.*

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Tailors and Attendants	26	0	0			
Attendants (9) on Progress	13	19	0			
Porter (60 days)	3	0	0			
Diet of Officers (60 days)	30	0	0			
Necessaries bought by Yeoman	3	13	0	76	12	0

(ii.) *December to February.*

Tailors and Attendants	113	8	8			
Property-makers, Embroiderers, Haberdashers	39	1	2			
Painters	35	18	2			
Porter (80 days, 15 nights)	4	15	0			
Diet of Officers (80 days, 15 nights)	47	10	0	240	13	0

B. Emptions and Provisions.

(i.) *March to November.* Nil.

(ii.) *December to February.*

Mercers (4)	938	8	7
Draper	52	15	3
Upholster	32	5	8
Silkwomen (Joan Bowll and another)	74	14	4½
Petty Cash (Comptroller)	1	0	0
Carried forward	1099	3	10½

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	1099	3	10½			
Petty Cash (Yeoman)	80	11	2			
Implements for Properties	14	11	1			
Furrier	2	2	6			
Colours	13	16	1			
Wiredrawer	6	16	0			
Vizards (Thomas Giles)	4	5	0			
Necessaries for Hunters	1	1	8			
Device for Thunder and Lightning	1	2	0			
Chandler	5	15	5			
Hire of Armour	3	9	8			
Buskin-maker	0	11	4			
Brian Dodmer (travelling expenses, &c.)	3	0	0			
Boat-hire, &c., for Comptroller	1	0	0			
,, ,, Clerk (*per* John Drawater)	1	0	0			
Green cloth, &c., for Clerk	3	6	8	1,241	12	5½

Summa Totalis.

	£	s.	d.
Wages and Allowances	317	5	0
Emptions and Provisions	1,241	12	5½
	£1,558	17	5½

In many cases reference is made to the bills of the tradesmen for further details. At the end of the account is appended a supplementary account, amounting to £26 3*s.* 2*d.*, for the three months from March to May, 1572, during which a further airing took place. The airings involved an elaborate process of what would now be called the 'spring-cleaning' of all the stuff in the office. There is also a list of six plays and six masks performed during Christmas and Shrovetide. The plays were acted by companies of men or children who were 'apparelled and ffurnished', and provided with 'apt howses, made of canvasse, fframed, ffashioned and paynted accordingly' by the Revels Office. It is noted that the six plays were 'chosen owte of many and ffownde to be the best that then were to be had; the same also being often perused and necessarely corrected and amended by all the afforeseide officers'. Four of the masks were new; the other two 'were but translated and otherwise garnished being of the former number by meanes wherof the chardge of workmanshipp and attendaunce is cheefely to be respected'. It will be observed that the Account does not include any items for the fees of the officers or for the hire of lodgings or storehouses. The

former were payable under their patents at the Exchequer, the latter provided in the royal house of St. John's. The officers get an allowance for diet when on active duty, either in the time of airings or in that of revels; and this is fixed, for each day or night, at 4*s.* for the Master, 2*s.* for the Clerk Comptroller, 2*s.* for the Clerk, and 2*s.* for the Yeoman. There is a similar allowance of 1*s.* for a Porter, described more fully in a later account as the Porter of St. John's Gate. His name was John Dauncy.[1] The Account discloses some changes in the establishment since 1559. Thomas Blagrave is still Clerk. Richard Lees had been succeeded as Clerk Comptroller on 30 December 1570 by Edward Buggin.[2] During the earlier part of the period John Holt is still Yeoman, but exercises his functions through a deputy, William Bowll, a Yeoman of the Chamber; he was replaced by John Arnold on 11 December 1571.[3] There is a letter to Cecil from William Bowll, written at some date after March 1571, in which he recites that he has recently delivered to Cecil letters from the Lord Treasurer (the Marquis of Winchester), Sir Thomas Benger, and John Holt, for a joint grant of the Yeomanship to himself and John Holt; that he has long served as Holt's deputy and paid him money on a composition as well as meeting some of the debts of the Office; that Holt is now dead and that he and his family will be undone unless Cecil procures him the post.[4] His suit, however, was obviously unsuccessful. Holt's tenure of the Yeomanship had thus extended from 1547 to 1571. He may himself have been an actor, if, as seems likely, he is the 'John Holt, momer', who received rewards for attendance on the Westminster boys at a pageant in 1561.

If Arnold was appointed in the winter of 1571, it was against him, rather than against Holt or his deputy Bowll, that a complaint was lodged with Burghley about a year later by one Thomas Giles. Giles was one of the tradesmen of the Revels. He is described in the Accounts as a haberdasher, and purchases of vizards were made from him. The burden of his complaint was that the officers of the Revels, and particularly the Yeoman, who had the custody of the masking garments, were in the habit of letting these out on hire, to their manifest deterioration, and, one fears, also to the injury of Giles's business. He enumerates twenty-one occasions upon which masks, including the new cloth of gold,

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 130, 135.
[2] Patent in Feuillerat, 58.
[3] Patent in Feuillerat, 72.
[4] Feuillerat, 408, from *S. P. D. Eliz. Add.* xx. 101; Collier, i. 230, who thinks that the application was for the Mastership of the Revels.

black and white, and murrey satin ones, made for the Queen's delectation during the previous Christmas, had been so let out to lords, lawyers, and citizens, in town and country, between January and November 1572.[1]

It is probable that Burghley, who became Lord Treasurer in July 1572, took early steps to look into the administration of the Revels Office, for which the death of Sir Thomas Benger about June of the same year afforded an opportunity.[2] Certainly there was no possibility of bringing about any immediate economy, for the embassy of the Duc de Montmorency from France had already caused a great increase of cost. The Revels bill for 1572–3 amounted to £1,427 12*s.* 6½*d.* or very little less than that for 1571–2. Of this about £1,000 was directly due to Montmorency's visit. Moreover, the greater part of the expenditure upon revels was not directly defrayed through the Office. They bought some stuff in the open market, and employed some workmen. But they had also large supplies from the Great Wardrobe, while the structure of banqueting-houses and the like was undertaken by the Office of Works. The total cost, therefore, for any one year would have to be pieced together from the accounts of all three offices. This task has never been essayed, but on Montmorency's coming an imprest of £200 was made to Lewis Stocket, Surveyor of the Works, and another of £300 to John Fortescue, Master of the Great Wardrobe, while a memorandum in Burghley's papers cites a warrant of 12 July 1572 which authorizes the delivery by Fortescue to Benger of stuffs to no less value than £1,757 8*s.* 1½*d.*[3]

Pending Burghley's investigation no patent was issued for a successor to Benger. During the Christmas of 1573, the oversight of the Office was committed jointly to Fortescue and to Henry Sackford, the Master of the Tents, and the whole of the account for the period from 1 June 1572 to 31 October 1573 is signed by them, together with the inferior officers of the Revels. There are signs of an ambition towards economy in entries showing that on several occasions during the year claims upon the Office were reduced after examina-

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 409; Collier, i. 191; from *Lansd. MS.* 13; cf. ch. v.

[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 429. He died in debt, and his will was not proved until 1577 (Chalmers, 482). This led me into thinking (*Tudor Revels*, 26) that during 1572–7 he was alive, but not actively exercising his functions, and possibly into some injustice in suggesting that he had 'in the end proved an extravagant and unbusinesslike Master'. Yet Blagrave's memorandum of 1573 (*vide infra*) seems to lay a special stress on the importance of appointing a Master who shall be 'neither gallant, prodigall, nedye, nor gredye'.

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 187, 456, correcting Collier, i. 198 and *Tudor Revels*, 26.

tion by the Comptroller and other officers.[1] The auditors in their turn had an eye upon the Office. A sum of £50 was originally included in the account with the explanation:

'Item more for new presses to be made thorowowte the whole storehowse for that the olde were so rotten that they coulde by no meanes be repayred or made any waye to serve agayne. The Queenes Maiesties store lyeng now on the ffloore in the store howse which of necessitie must preasently be provyded for before other workes can well beginne. Whiche presses being made as is desyred by the Officers wilbe a greate safegarde to the store preasently remayning and lykewise of the store to coome whereby many things may be preserved that otherwyse wilbe vtterly lost and spoyled contynually encreasing her Maiesties charge.'

To this is appended a note:

'Not allowid for so moche as the said presseis ar not begonn.'[2]

It may be admitted that the cost of the Revels would have been less if the officers had been in a position to pay for the goods supplied to them in ready money. They probably got small 'imprests' or advances at the beginning of the year when they could, but for the most part they had to obtain credit and satisfy their tradesmen with debentures, redeemable when the accounts had been audited and a warrant under the privy seal for the payment of the certified expenses issued. Elizabeth succeeded to an exchequer already burdened with the debt of past reigns, and the issue of these warrants was often delayed. William Bowll had made it part of his claim to be appointed Yeoman in succession to John Holt that he had made advances for 'payment to the workemen and other poore creditors for mony due unto them in the said office, accordinge to thear necessities before any warant graunted, only for to mayntayn the credit of the said office'. An undated letter is preserved amongst Burghley's papers in which he makes an attempt to recover a sum of £236 due to him for goods supplied over a period of two years and nine months.[3] A similar letter, written on behalf of the creditors and artificers serving the office, and signed by 'Poore Bryan Dodmer a creditour, to saue the labour of a great number whose exclamacion is lamentable', refers specifically to the unpaid balance of the office account on 28 February 1574, which stood at £1,550 5*s.* 8*d.*[4] Bryan Dodmer had received

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 157, 160, 172, 178.
[2] Ibid. 186.
[3] *Tudor Revels*, 28; Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 416; from *Lansd. MS.* 83, f. 145, misdated in pencil 'July 1597'.
[4] *Tudor Revels*, 29; Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 412; from *Lansd. MS.* 83, f. 147. Dodmer was still pursuing a claim in the Court of Requests in May 1576 (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 413).

a legacy from Sir Thomas Cawarden in 1559, and is shown by the account of 1571–2 to have been at that time occupied in the affairs of the Revels Office, although not on the establishment. To 1573 and 1574 may be ascribed three memoranda, which were evidently prepared for Burghley's assistance in considering schemes of reform. Two of these, although longer than can be printed here, are singularly illuminating to students of departmental history. One, in particular, gives a very capable summary of the situation, and is informed by a good deal of sound administrative sense.[1] It begins with a short historical notice of the origin and foundation of the Revels and a suggestion for a fresh amalgamation of the Mastership with those of the Tents and Toils. The writer then considers the possibility of either farming out the office, or fixing a definite allowance for all ordinary charges, and rejects both proposals as impracticable. Nor does he see much room for economy in the 'airings', or in a reduction in the number of officers; on the contrary, he is in favour of supplementing the Master, who must give attendance at Court, by a working head of the Office with the rank of Serjeant. He lays stress on the importance of co-operation amongst the officers, and while not prepared to abrogate the quasi-independence of the Master which the appointment of the inferior officers by patent gave them, submits an elaborate draft of new ordinances provisionally dated in the regnal year 1572–3, and intended to replace those which he understands to have been delivered 'before my time' to some of the Queen's Privy Council.[2] This deals, not only with the functions of each officer, but also with the time-table of the year's work, the control of the artificers, the economical employment of wardrobe stuff, the books to be kept, and the avoidance of debt by a liberal imprest. An historian of the stage can wish that the suggestion had been adopted for order to be annually given 'to a connynge paynter to enter into a fayer large ligeard booke in the manner of limnynge the maskes and shewes sett fourthe in that last seruice, to thende varyetye may be vsed from tyme to tyme'. I think that the author of this document was probably Buggin, the Clerk Comptroller, since the two other memoranda are clearly on internal evidence the work of Blagrave, the Clerk, and one of the Yeomen, and Burghley is likely to have given each officer

[1] Text in full in *Tudor Revels*, 1, 31, and Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 5, from *Lansd. MS.* 83, f. 158.

[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 432, points out that, as Elizabeth's Privy Council is referred to, these ordinances can hardly have been those of Cawarden (cf. p. 74) as I suggested in *Tudor Revels*, 34.

a chance of expressing his views. It might, however, have been Henry Sackford, in view of the suggestion for amalgamation with the Tents, and in any case Buggin probably had Sackford's interests in mind, not to speak of his own chances of obtaining the contemplated Serjeanty. Blagrave's proposals are in matters of detail not unlike Buggin's, but he does not endorse the suggestion of a Serjeant, and is less skilful in keeping his personal ambitions in the background.[1]

If it please her highnes to bestowe the *Master*ship of the office vpon me (as I trust myne experience by acquayntaunce w*ith* those thaffaires and contynuall dealing therein by the space of xxvij or xxviij yeres deserveth, being also the auncient of the office by at the leaste xxiiij of those yeres; otherwise I wolde be lothe hereafter to deale nor medle w*ith* it nor in it further then apperteyneth to the clerke, whose allowaunce is so small as I gyve it holy to be discharged of the toyle and attendaunce). I haue hetherto w*ith*oute recompence to my greate chardge and hynderaunce borne the burden of the *Master*, and taken the care and paynes of that, others haue had the thankes and rewarde for, w*hich* I trust her Ma*iest*ie will not put me to w*ith*oute the fee, alowaunce, and estimac*i*on longing to it, nor if her highnes vouchesafe not to bestowe it vpon me to let me passe w*ith*oute recompence for that is done and paste.

If the Fee and allowaunce be thought to muche, then let what her Ma*iest*ie and Honerable counsaile shall thinke mete for any man that shall supplie that burden and place to haue toward*es* his chardg*es* be appointed of certeyntie, and I will take that, and serve for as litle as any man that meanes to Deale truly, so I be not to greate a loser by it.

The Yeoman's *Memorandum* is short enough to be given in full.[2]

A note of sarten thing*es* which are very nedefull to be Redressed in the offys of the Revelles.

1. Fyrste the Romes or Loging*es*, where the garments and other thing*es*, as hedpeces and suche lyke, dothe lye, Is in suche decaye for want of repa*r*acions, that it hath by that meanes perished A very greate longe wall, which parte thereof is falne doune and hath broke undoune A greate presse, which stoode all Alongest the same, by w*hich* meanes I ame fayne to laye the garment*es* vppon the grounde, to the greate hurt of the same, so as if youre honoure ded se the same it woolde petye you to see suche stoffe so yll bestowed.

2. Next there is no convenyent Romes for the Artifycers to wourke

[1] Text in full in *Tudor Revels*, 42, and Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 17, from *Lansd. MS.* 83, f. 154. The time-references agree with 1573 or 1574, if Blagrave's unestablished service in the Revels began as early as 1546.

[2] *Lansd. MS.* 83, f. 149. The reference to two years' debts suggests a date, when compared with Dodmer's, in the summer of 1574; if so, the writer will be Fish, rather than Arnold.

in, but that Taylours, Paynters, Proparatiue makers, and Carpenders are all fayne to wourke in one rome, which is A very greate hinderaunce one to Another, which thinge nedes not for theye are slacke anowe of them selves.

3. More, there ys two whole yeares charges be hinde vn payde, to the greate hinderaunce of the poore Artyfycers that wourke there. In so mvche that there be A greate parte of them that haue byn dryven to sell there billes or debentars for halfe that is dewe vnto them by the same.

4. More, yt hath broughte the offyce in suche dyscredet with those that dyd delyver wares into the offyce, that theye will delyuer yt in for A thirde parte more then it is woorthe, or ellce we can get no credet of them for the same, which thinge is A very greate hinderaunce to the Queenes maiestie and A greate discredet to those that be offecers in that place, which thinge for my parte I Ame very sory to see.

This is endorsed,

'For the Reuels. Matters to be redressed there.'

The documents are proposals for reform rather than statements of existing practice; but proposals for reform made by permanent officials are not generally very sweeping, and I think it may be taken that we get a pretty fair notion of the actual working of a Government department in the sixteenth century, not without certain hints of jealousies and disputes between the various officers as to their respective functions and privileges, which in those days as in these occasionally tended to interfere with the smooth working of the machine. The determination of these functions and privileges by regulation; the keeping of regular books, inventories, journals, and ledgers; the institution of a system of finance which would avoid the necessity of employing credit; the prohibition of the hiring-out of Revels stuff; these are amongst the improvements in organization which suggested themselves to practical men who were not in the least likely to suggest the transference of the duties of their own rather superfluous Office to the Office of Works or the Wardrobe. Both Buggin and Blagrave ask that the hands of the officers might be strengthened by a commission; that is, apparently, a warrant entitling them to enforce service on behalf of the Crown, such as the Master of the Children of the Chapel had to 'take up' singing-boys, and other departments of the Household, including probably the Tents, had for the purveyance of provisions and cartage. Probably the Revels had already enjoyed this authority upon special occasions. The *Account* for the banqueting house of 1572 includes an item for 'flowers of all sortes taken up by comyssion and

gathered in the feeldes '.[1] At the bottom of the documents there is a feeling that the weak point in the organization is the Mastership. The Master had to be a courtier, dancing attendance on the Queen and the Lord Chamberlain, and was likely to have the qualities and failings of a courtier; and then he came to the office, and gave instructions to people who knew their own business much better than he did.

Blagrave's ambitions to become Master of the Office were not wholly gratified. He was allowed to act as Master for some years, but he never received a patent, and after Benger's death he had the mortification of seeing the post given to another, while he was left to content himself with his much despised Clerkship. His regency lasted from November 1573 until Christmas 1579, and his signature stands alone or heads those of the other officers upon the Accounts relating to that period, with the exception of the last, on which the name of the incoming Master appears.[2] His appointment was presumably from year to year. It is stated in the Account for 1573–4 to have been made by 'her Majestie's pleasure signefyed by the right honorable L. Chamberlaine', and in that for 1574–5 to appear from 'sundry letters from the Lorde Chamberlayne'. And the vacancy emphasized the dependence of the Revels upon that great branch of the tripartite Household, the Chamber, over which the Lord Chamberlain presided. All Blagrave's activities were subject to control by his superior officer. He and his subordinates were constantly going by boat or horse to Richmond, or wherever the Court might be, to take instructions from the Lord Chamberlain, to submit patterns of masks and alterations of plays, and to obtain payment of expenses.[3] Blagrave himself had a house at Bedwyn in Wiltshire, and couriers were sometimes sent after him when his presence in London was urgently needed.[4] Upon his entrance into office the officers were called together 'for colleccion and showe of eche thinge prepared for her Maiesties regall disporte and recreacion as also the store wherewith to ffurnish, garnish and sett forth the same; wherof, as also of the whole state of the office the L. Chamberlayne according to his honours appointment was throughly advertised'.[5] The store was also carefully perused and the inventories checked upon the

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 164.

[2] A *Declared Account* for 14 Feb. 1578 to 14 Feb. 1579 is in Blagrave's name.

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 212, 218, 238, 247, 267, 277, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300.

[4] Ibid. 192, 266, 277, 297 301.

[5] Ibid. 191.

death of John Arnold the Yeoman, and the appointment on 20 January 1574 of Walter Fish in his room.[1] The Accounts continue to include allowances for the diet of the Clerk as well as that of the Master. I have no doubt that Blagrave was quite capable of drawing them both; but it is also likely enough that some unestablished person undertook the duties of 'Acting' Clerk. If so, this was most probably Bryan Dodmer, who was very useful on financial business during 1573–4 and 1574–5. After this year he disappears from the Accounts and his place is apparently taken by John Drawater. William Bewll, the ex-Deputy-Yeoman and silkweaver, and Thomas Giles, the haberdasher, in spite of their complaints against the Office, continue to supply it with goods.[2]

The general character of the Accounts, both under Fortescue and Sackford, and under Blagrave, is much the same as that of the one, already analysed, for 1571–2. Periods of activity, mainly at Christmas and Shrovetide, still alternate with periods of quiescence, stock-taking, and 'mving'. Occasionally the Office has to bestir itself to accompany a progress.[3] Some unusually detailed entries in 1570–7 give interesting information as to the rates of wages ordinarily paid to workmen. The head tailor got 20*d.* for each day or night, and other tailors 12*d.* Carpenters got 16*d.*; the Porter and other attendants 12*d.* Painters, haberdashers, property-makers, joiners, carvers, and wire-drawers were paid 'at sundrie rates'. In a later year, 1579–80, the first and second painter got 2*s.* and 20*d.* respectively, and the rest 18*d.* The first wire-drawer got 20*d.*, and the rest 16*d.*[4] The payments for night-work really represent double wages for overtime, since we learn from Buggin and Blagrave that the length of a night was reckoned at about half that of a day. The workmen who waited on the mask before Montmorency in 1572 got extra rewards, because they 'had no tyme to eat theyer supper'; and while the banqueting-house was building Bryan Dodmer had to buy bread and cheese 'to serve the plasterers that wroughte all the nighte and might not be spared nor trusted to go abrode to supper'.[5] An important function of the Office consisted in 'calling together of suntry players and perusing, ytting and reformyng theier matters (otherwise not convenient to be shewen before her Majestie)'.[6] Dodmer paid 40*s.* in 1574–5 for 'paynes in perusing and reformyng

[1] Patent in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 73; cf. 191, Collier, i. 227, and *Variorum*, iii. 499.
[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 197, 204, 212, 228, 247, 268, 277, 291, 300.
[3] Ibid. 182, 225.
[4] Ibid. 150, 321.
[5] Ibid. 102, 105.
[6] Ibid. 191.

of playes sundry tymes as neede required for her Maiestie's lyking', and it is a pity that the name of the payee is left blank in the Account.[1] When the plays had been chosen and knocked into shape, they had to be rehearsed. Now and then they were taken before the Lord Chamberlain for this purpose; but as a rule the rehearsals went on in the presence of the officers at St. John's. Here were a 'greate chambere where the workes were doone and the playes rezited', a storehouse, and the mansions of the officers. The Clerk had an office with a nether room next the yard.[2] Fish complains of the inconvenience of having only one room for every kind of artificer to work in. Items for yellow cotton to line 'the Monarkes gowne' and for his jerkin and hose perhaps point to the use of a lay figure.[3] One Nicholas Newdigate was extremely useful in hearing and training the children who frequently performed.[4] Naturally these gave a good deal of trouble. At Shrovetide 1574 nine of them were employed for a mask at Hampton Court. They had diet and lodging at St. John's, 'whiles thay learned theier partes and jestures meete for the mask'. They were taken from Paul's Wharf to Hampton Court in a barge with six oars and two 'tylt whirreys'. They arrived on Monday, but the Queen would not see them until the Tuesday, and they were lodged for the two nights at Mother Sparo's at Kingston. An Italian woman and her daughter were employed to dress their heads. When they got back to London on Ash-Wednesday, 'sum of them being sick and colde and hungry', fire and victuals were provided at Blackfriars. Each child received a reward of 1*s.*[5] Trouble was caused also sometimes by the behaviour of the courtiers who took part in festivities. Six horns garnished with silver were provided at a cost of 18*s.*, for a mask of hunters on 1 January 1574, and there is a note in the Account that these horns 'the maskers detayned and yet dooth kepe them against the will of all the officers'. This sort of difficulty was traditional. It was already perplexing the worthy Gibson more than half a century before.[6] That the practice of lending out the Revels stuff was not wholly abandoned is shown by an application from Magdalen College, Oxford, to Tilney in 1592 for furniture for a play.[7] Finance was also a cause of trouble. On his appointment in 1573 Blagrave succeeded in obtaining a 'prest' of £200 to begin the year upon. In 1574 he did the same, but not

[1] Ibid. 242.
[2] Ibid. 179, 186, 277, Table III.
[3] Ibid. 185.
[4] Ibid. 204, 219, 268.
[5] Ibid. 218.
[6] Ibid. 202; cf. *Tudor Revels*, 5.
[7] *Hist. MSS.* iv. 300.

until Dodmer had applied in vain to the Lord Chamberlain, the Lord Treasurer, and Mr. Secretary Walsingham, and was finally 'after long attendaunce (and that none of the aforenamed coulde get the Queenes Maiestie to resolve therin) dryven to trouble her Maiestie himselfe and by special peticion obtayned as well the grawnt for cc[li] in prest as the dettes to be paid'. At the end of each year there were formalities and delays to be gone through before the bills could be paid. The accounts had to be made up, to be passed by the auditors, and to be declared before the Lord Treasurer and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Then a royal warrant had to be obtained for a privy seal, then the privy seal itself, and finally actual payment at the Exchequer. All these processes necessitated constant fees and gratuities. In 1579 the estimated charges for audit and payment amounted to £8. For his considerable financial services in 1574–5 Bryan Dodmer demanded £13 6*s.* 8*d.*, but this was ruthlessly cut down by the officers to £6 13*s.* 4*d.* They in their turn found the auditor disallowing a small payment because it had been entered in the books after the sum had been cast, and was not properly certified. Dodmer had advanced the money, but he could not be repaid until the following year.[1]

A letter of 8 April 1577 from Leicester to Burghley reminds him that a certain suit of Sir Jerome Bowes and others 'touching plays' had been referred to them, together with the Lord Chamberlain, by the Queen for consideration. They had 'myslyked of the perpetuytie they sutors desierd', but a report still had to be made.[2] There is nothing to show the nature of this 'suit', but it is not unnatural to conjecture that it arose in some way out of the vacancy in the Mastership. No more, however, is heard of Sir Jerome Bowes in this connexion. It was not until seven years after Benger's death that Blagrave met with the rebuff of finding himself passed over in favour of an outsider, and reduced to his former position of Clerk, with its subordinate duties and its miserable allowances for the 'ordynary grene cloth, paper, incke, counters, deskes, standishes', and so forth. The new Master was Edmund Tilney, who had dedicated to Elizabeth, in 1568, a dialogue on matrimony under the title of *The Flower of Friendship*. Tilney was a connexion of Lord Howard of Effingham, to whose influence at Court he probably owed his appointment. His patent is dated on 24 July 1579, but the fee was to run from the previous Christmas, and

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 227, 247, 277, 300, 310, 457.
[2] App. D, No. xxxiii.

he may therefore have formally assumed his duties at that period. His signature is attached with those of Blagrave and the other officers to the Account for the whole of the period from 14 February 1578 to 31 October 1579, but the details do not afford any evidence that he took a personal share in the work of the Office.[1] In 1581 he was spoken of as a possible ambassador to Spain, but this does not appear to have led to anything.[2]

Only a few detailed Accounts belonging to Tilney's Mastership are in existence. These are made up regularly from each 1 November to the following 31 October. They do not disclose any noteworthy change in the previous routine of the Office. On 8 August 1580 Thomas Sackford, a Master of the Requests, and Sir Owen Hopton, the Lieutenant of the Tower, were instructed by the Council to take a view of the Revels stuff upon the appointment of the new Master, and to deliver inventories of the same to Tilney. Accordingly, a charge of 40*s.* 'for the ingrossinge of three paire of indentid inventories' appears in the Account.[3] Blagrave appears to have sulked at first, for in 1581 the employment of a professional scribe to make up the accounts was explained by the absence of a clerk. The auditors, very properly, made a marginal note of surprise, and Blagrave resumed his duties.[4] In 1582–3 considerable repairs were required at the Revels Office, owing to the fact that a chamber which formed part of Blagrave's lodging had fallen down. An office and a chamber for the Master seem for a time to have been provided at Court during the attendance of the Master, and warmed with billets and coals at the expense of the Revels, but by 1587–8 they had been crowded out, and an allowance of 10*s.* was made for the hire of rooms.[5] Another entry for 1582–3 marks an epoch of some importance in the history of the Elizabethan stage. On 10 March 1583 Tilney was summoned to Court by a letter from Mr. Secretary [Walsingham] 'to choose out a companie of players for her Maiestie'. Horse hire and charges on the journey cost him 20*s.*[6] Outside the Accounts there is one document of considerable interest belonging to the early years of Tilney's rule. This is a patent, dated 24 December 1581, and giving to the Master of the Revels such a 'commission' or grant of exceptional powers over the subjects of the realm, as had been stated in the *Memoranda*

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 55 (text of patent), 285, 302, 310, 312; *Variorum*, iii. 57; Chalmers, 482; Collier, i. 230, 235; *Dramatic Records*, 2.
[2] Digges, 359.
[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 330.
[4] Ibid. 434.
[5] Ibid. 354, 358, 370, 381, 391.
[6] Ibid. 359.

of 1573 to be eminently desirable in the interests of the office.[1] The Master is authorized to take and retain such workmen 'at competent wages', and take such 'stuff, ware, or merchandise', 'at price reasonable', together with such 'carriages', by land and by water, as he may consider to be necessary or expedient for the service of the Revels. He or his deputy may commit recalcitrant persons to ward. He may protect his workmen from arrest, and they are not to be liable to forfeit if their service in the Revels obliges them to break outside contracts for piece-work. The licensing powers also conferred upon the Master by this patent are considered elsewhere.[2]

Tilney's accession to office coincided with the beginning of the period of heightened splendour in Court entertainments, due to the negotiations for Elizabeth's marriage with the Duke of Anjou.[3] A magnificent banqueting-house was built at Whitehall, and Sidney, Fulke Greville, and others, equipped as the Foster Children of Desire, besieged the Fortress of Perfect Beauty in the tilt-yard. One might have expected to find a considerably larger expenditure accounted for by the officers of the Revels. But this was not so, except for the one winter of Anjou's visit. The cost of the Office, which in 1571–3 had grown to about £1,500 a year, rapidly fell again. In 1573–4 it was about £670; in 1574–5 about £580; and thereafter it generally stood at not more than from £250 to £350. In 1581–2, however, it reached £630.[4] It is probable that the figures do not point to any real reduction of expenditure, but only mean that, after the experience of John Fortescue, the Master of the Wardrobe, as Acting Master of the Revels in 1572–3, it was found economical to supply the needs of the Office, to a greater extent even than in the past, through the organization of the Wardrobe and the Office of Works, instead of by the direct purchase of goods or employment of labour in the open market. Stowe records, for example, that the banqueting-house of 1581 cost £1,744 19*s.*, but no part of this appears in the Revels Account, although the banqueting-house of 1572 had cost the Office £224 6*s.* 10*d.*[5] Probably it was all met by the Office of Works. About 1596 a further reform in the interests of economy was attempted, by the establishment of a fixed annual allowance for expenses, including the 'wages' or 'diet' hitherto allowed to the officers for each day or night of actual attendance at 'airings' or at the rehearsals or performances of plays. The last pay-

[1] See text in App. D, No. lvi.
[2] Cf. ch. x.
[3] Cf. ch. i.
[4] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* Table II.
[5] Stowe, *Annales*, 689; Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 168; cf. ch. i.

ment under the old system was made on 30 May 1594 by a warrant to Tilney for a sum of £311 2*s.* 2*d.* in respect of works and wares and officers' wages for 1589–92, together with an imprest of £100 for 1592–3.[1] The next warrant was made out on 25 January 1597, and directed the payment of £200 for 1593–6, together with an annual payment of £66 6*s.* 8*d.*, 'as composition for defraying the charges of the office for plays only, according to a rate of a late reformation and composition for ordinary charges there'.[2] The amount of £311 2*s.* 2*d.* paid for the three years 1589–92 is so small as to suggest that the distinction between 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' charges may have already existed during the period, and may thus have preceded the reduction of 'ordinary' charges to a 'composition'. The warrant of 25 January 1597, however, never became operative. There is an entry of it in the Docquet Book of the Signet Office, and in the margin are the notes 'Remanet: neuer passed the Seales' and 'Staid by the *Lord* Thre*asorer*: vacat'. Fortunately we are able to trace the causes which led to this interposition by Burghley. It will perhaps be remembered that Edward Buggin, in his *Memorandum* of 1573, had considered a possible reform of the administration of the Revels Office on lines very similar to those now adopted, and had decided that it was impracticable.[3] Doubtless the same view was held by the officers of 1597, and after the manner of permanent officials they took steps to ensure that it should be impracticable. Disputes arose between the Master and the inferior officers as to the distribution of the sum allowed for ordinary charges, and, pending a settlement of these, all payments out of the Office were suspended. The result was a memorial to Burghley from the 'creditors and servitors' of the Revels, which called attention to the fact that five years' arrears due to them were withheld 'only throughe the discention amoungest the officers'.[4]

This was in the first instance referred to Tilney for his observations, and he writes:

All *that* I can saye Is, *that ther* Is a Composition layd vppo*n* me by Quens ma*iest*e and signed by her self, rated verbatimly by certayn orders sett down by my *Lord* Treasorer vnder his *Lordshippes* Hand, whervnto I haue appealed, because *the* other officers will nott be satisficed w*ith* ayni reason, wherto I am now teyd & nott vnto the*i*e friuilus demandes. Wherefore lett *the*m sett down In writtinge *the*

[1] *S. P. D. Eliz.* ccxlviii, p. 512.

[2] Ibid. cclxii, p. 351. The calendar does not, however, note the *marginalia* to the docquet referred to below.

[3] Cf. p. 82.

[4] *Tudor Revels*, 64, and Feuillerat, 417, from *Lansd. MS.* 83, f. 170.

speciall Causes why they should reuoke the former orders and the Composition grounded therein. Then am I to reply vnto the same as I can, for tell then thes petitioners can nott be satisfied.

Ed. Tyllney.

The document was then referred to Burghley, with the following summary of its contents:

5 November 1597.

They shewe that there are vppon them five yeares last past for wares delyuered and service done in the office of the Revelles amongste the dissension amongest the officers to their great hinderance beinge deare yeares beeinge poore men.

Vppon their motion to the master of the office his answere is that the fault is not in him, but he is redy to satisfie them all such allowances as are due vnto them, either by your Lordshippes former order, or in right; then can challenge, vppon which order the master doth wholly relie but the other reiect the same.

for that there is no likelyhood of their agreement, whereby the petitioners may be satisfied. Their Humbly pray your Lordshippes to Commaund som order for the relieving their poore estates.

Burghley then gave this direction:

One of the Auditours in the presence with one of the Iustices of the Escheqr to heare the officers of the Revels, and thes petitioners, and either to ende the questions betweene them, or to certifie their opinions.

W. Burghley.

The document is then further endorsed with the report of Burghley's referees:

quinto Januarii 1597 [1598].

Forasmuch as your good Lordshipp is to be aduertised that after longe trauell and paines taken betweene the Master of the Revelles and the Officers thereof, It is agreed by our ordinary that out of the xl^li^ by yeare allowed for Fees or wages for their attendaunce, the Master of the Revelles shall yearely allowe and paye the seuerall Somes of mony vnder written, viz.

To the Clarke Comptroller of that office . . .	viij^li^
To the Yeoman of the Revelles	viij^li^
To the Groome of the Office	xl^s^
To the Porter of St. Johns	xx^s^

whereof xx^s^ parcell of the same vjs^li^ allowed to the yeoman, is to be aunswered by the same yeoman after this yeare to the said Groome.

Which yf it may stande with your good Lordshippes liking, wee truste will bring contentment quietnes and dutifull service to her maiestie.

John Scherton.
Jo. Conyers.

Hereon Burghley comments :

My desire is to be better satisfied howe the Creditours shall be payd.
W. Burghley.

Here the minutes stop, but Burghley must have been satisfied and must have allowed the arrangement to go forward, for on 10 January 1598 a new warrant was issued, in the place of that previously stayed, for the £200 due on account of 1593–6, and for the annual £66 6*s.* 8*d.*, 'by way of composition for defraying the ordinary services of plays only'. Apparently the fixed rate was made retrospective for 1593–6.[1] Two or three points of interest arise from the document just printed. It seems curious that no share in the composition is awarded to the Clerk. Possibly Blagrave, old and disappointed, was in practical retirement at Bedwyn ; but in that case he would naturally have appointed and claimed allowance for a deputy. On the other hand, a new post, of Groom of the Revels, corresponding to that of Groom of the Tents which had existed since 1544, seems to have been created, probably for the benefit of Thomas Clatterbooke, who, unless two generations are involved, had served the Office continuously as a foreman tailor since 1548 ;[2] and it is to be gathered that some redistribution of duties and emoluments between the Yeoman and the Groom was in progress. The Porter of St. John's Gate, also, now seems to be classed as an officer, or perhaps rather a 'servitor', of the Revels ; and in this post John Dauncy has been succeeded since 1588–9 by John Griffeth.[3] The sum of £66 6*s.* 8*d.* allowed for ordinary charges was evidently made up of £40 for officers' 'wages' and £26 6*s.* 8*d.* for tradesmen's bills and miscellaneous expenses. This last sum is so small as to suggest that the Office had been relieved both of the emption of stuffs and of the payment of tailors and property-makers. After paying £19 to the inferior officers, Tilney had £21 left for his own 'wages'. This amount is out of proportion to the double rate, of 4*s.* as against the 2*s.* paid to each inferior officer, which the Master had been accustomed to receive for each day's or night's attendance. But the accounts for 1582–3, 1584–5, and 1587–8 show that the attendances made by Tilney, who possibly exercised a much more detailed supervision of his Office than either Benger or Cawarden had attempted, were far in excess, during those years, of those of his subordinates. Every officer attended for the twenty

[1] *S. P. D. Eliz.* cclxvi, p. 5.
[2] Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 29 ; cf. p. 100.
[3] Feuillerat, 394, 417.

annual days of 'airing' and for the actual nights, which were sixteen in 1582–3, and fourteen in 1584–5 and 1587–8, of the performances. In addition, Tilney attended for 106, 117, and 116 days respectively, and the other officers for only 60, 51, and 28 (in the case of the Yeoman, 38) days respectively, in these three years.[1] Probably he liked to be at Court, whether there was much to do or not. The average allowances for wages had therefore been about £29 10*s.* a year for the Master and £7 10*s.* a year for each inferior officer, so that the composition was by no means unduly in Tilney's favour. Moreover, he had introduced a practice of taking to Court a doorkeeper and three other attendants, and charging 1*s.* a day as diet for each. Probably these were his personal servants, and he got no further allowance for them under the composition. The precedence of the Master of the Revels at Court was fixed by a certificate of the Heralds in 1588, which directed that in the procession to St. Paul's for a thanksgiving after the Armada he should walk with the Knights Bachelor.[2]

Of course, the 'wages' dealt with by the composition and charged to the Revels Account were quite distinct from the 'fees' payable to the officers out of the Exchequer in virtue of their patents. These had been settled in Cawarden's time, and, so far as the inferior officers were concerned, do not appear to have been varied since. The Clerk Comptroller was entitled to 8*d.* a day, together with four yards of woollen cloth, worth 6*s.* 8*d.* each, from the Wardrobe. In practice, however, the livery had been replaced by a money allowance of 26*s.* 8*d.* charged half on the Revels and half on the Tents.[3] The Clerk had 8*d.* a day, and a money payment from the Treasury of 24*s.* a year in lieu of livery; the Yeoman 6*d.* a day, and a livery 'such as Yeomen of the household have' at the Wardrobe. The Master's fee, alike in the patents of Cawarden, Benger, and Tilney, is given as £10. But Tilney, according to a statement made by his successor about 1611, received £100 'for a better recompence'.[4] In addition to fee and wages, each of the officers was entitled under his patent to an official residence. The Master held his place 'cum omnibus domibus mansionibus regardis proficuis iuribus libertatibus et advantagiis eidem officio quovismodo pertinentibus sive spectantibus vel tali officio pertinere sive spectare debentibus'. The Clerk Comptroller could claim a house, 'ubi

[1] Feuillerat, 352, 360, 367, 372, 379, 382.
[2] *S. P. D.* cclxxix. 86. [3] Feuillerat, 108.
[4] Chalmers, 486, 490; *S. P. D. Jac. I*, lxv. 2. The fee lists (cf. p. 29) confirm this, sometimes adding 'diet in court'.

paviliones . . . positi sunt aut erunt' to be assigned by the Master of the Tents; the Clerk, one at the *staura* of the Revels or the Tents, to be assigned by the Master of one or other Office; the Yeoman 'one sufficient house or mancion such as hereafter shall be assigned to him' for the keeping of the vestures. Cawarden had provided these houses at the Blackfriars and had taken allowances in his accounts of £10 for his own and £5 each for those of his three subordinates, as well as one of £6 13*s.* 4*d.* for the work and store rooms of the Office.[1] After his death suitable lodgings were available at St. John's. During the interregnum the Master's lodging was utilized as a supplementary storehouse. It was consequently not ready for Tilney on his appointment, and he was allowed £13 6*s.* 8*d.* a year for lodgings elsewhere.[2] An undated letter from him at the Revels Office to Sir William More, complaining of the conduct of a neighbour, suggests that he found these at the Blackfriars, and here he seems to have remained, at any rate until 1582.[3] But by 1586–7 he had moved to St. John's, where he occupied not his proper lodging but that of the Comptroller, for which he paid £16 a year. This we learn from a careful survey made at that date by Thomas Graves, Surveyor of the Office of Works.[4] He was comfortably housed enough, for he had thirteen chambers, with a parlour, hall, kitchen, stable and other appurtenances, and a 'convenient garden'. The Clerk had eleven rooms and a stable, and the Yeoman seven and a barn. The addition of the Master's lodging to the space available for official purposes had presumably removed the difficulties of accommodation of which Fish had complained in 1574. In addition to the 'Great Hall' and a 'great chamber', there were a cutting house and three 'woorking housez' below the hall. It may be added that there had been some changes during Tilney's Mastership, both of Clerk Comptroller and of Yeoman. On 15 October 1584 William Honing was

[1] Feuillerat, 108. Ibid. 310, 463.

[3] *Hist. MSS.* vii. 661; Feuillerat, 467.

[4] Feuillerat, 47. Owing to the omission of Burghley's title in the address of the report, I misdated it in *Tudor Revels*, 20. The history of St. John's is given by W. P. Griffith, *An Architectural Notice of St. John's Priory, Clerkenwell* (*1 London and Middlesex Arch. Soc. Trans.* iii. 157); A. W. Clapham, *St. John of Jerusalem, Clerkenwell* (*St. Paul's Ecclesiological Soc. Trans.* vii. 37). It was a Priory of the Knights Hospitallers, founded *c.* 1100, and enlarged in the fifteenth century. The Gatehouse, which still stands, was rebuilt by Prior Thomas Docwra in 1504. After the dissolution in 1540, the stones of the church were used for Somerset House, and the rest granted to Dudley. Mary resumed it and refounded the Priory. After the second dissolution by Elizabeth, the property remained in the hands of the Crown.

appointed Comptroller in place of Edward Buggin.[1] On 25 June 1596, Honing having resigned, Edmund Pakenham was appointed as from 29 September 1595.[2] The last Yeoman of the reign was Edward Kirkham. His patent, in succession to Walter Fish, then dead, is dated on 28 April 1586.[3] But it refers to his 'service done in the Revels', and it is clear from the account for 1582–3 that he was already employed during that year, probably as deputy to Fish, in whose place he signed the book.[4] Fish signed that for 1580–1, and that for 1581–2 is missing. Kirkham's activities as a member of the syndicate formed to finance the Chapel plays in 1601 are a matter for discussion elsewhere.[5]

Tilney remained Master of the Revels until his death on 20 August 1610. But with the new reign he appears to have exercised most of his functions through his nephew, Sir George Buck, as his deputy and prospective successor. Buck had been in the Cadiz expedition of 1596, and was not improbably the Mr. Buck who carried dispatches for Cecil to Middelburgh in the Low Countries and afterwards in England during the autumn of 1601.[6] At the funeral of Elizabeth he received livery as an Esquire of the Body, probably extraordinary.[7] Hopes of the Mastership seem to have been held out to him as early as 1597, to the despair of another Esquire of the Body, John Lyly, the dramatist, who considered that he had claims upon the reversion to the Mastership, and pretty clearly regarded the bestowal of it upon another as a distinct breach of faith on the part of the Queen. Several letters of his referring to the matter are preserved at Hatfield and elsewhere. The earliest and most important of these is dated 22 December 1597 and addressed to Sir Robert Cecil. Herein Lyly says:

'I haue not byn importunat, that thes 12 yeres with vnwearied pacienc haue entertayned the proroguing of her maiesties promises, which if in the 13 may conclud with the Parlement, I will think the greves of tymes past but pastymes . . . Offices in Reuersion are forestalld, in possession ingrost, & that of the Reuells countenanced upon Buck, wherein the Justic of an oyre shewes his affection to the keper & partialty to the sheppard, a french fauor.'

[1] Patent in Feuillerat, 60.
[2] Patent in Feuillerat, 63.
[3] Ibid. 74.
[4] Ibid. 360.
[5] Cf. ch. xii.
[6] *Hatfield MSS.* xi. 359, 379, 380. The 'Mr. Buck' implicated in the Essex rebellion of 1601 (*Hist. MSS.* xi. 4. 10) was Francis Buck (*Hatfield MSS.* xi. 214).
[7] *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, 554. Can he also have been a Gentleman of the Chapel? A Gentleman was sworn in 'in Mr. Buckes roome' on 2 July 1603, just after he became acting Master (Rimbault, 6).

To the Queen herself Lyly wrote :

'I was entertayned your Maiesties servant by your owne gratious ffavour, stranghthened with condicions, that I should ayme all my courses att the Revells (I dare not saye, with a promise, butt a hope-ffull Item, of the Reversion); ffor the which, theis tenn yeares, I haue attended, with an vnwearyed patience, and I knowe not whatt crabb tooke mee ffor an oyster, that, in the middest of the svnnshine of your gratious aspect, hath thrust a stone betwene the shelles, to eate mee alyve, that onely lyve on dead hopes.'

The date of this petition is probably 1598, since a second letter to Cecil, dated 9 September 1598, specifies the same period of 'ten yeres', during which Lyly had had 'nothing applied to my wantes but promises'. On 27 February 1601, a third letter to Cecil, asking for his aid in obtaining a grant out of property forfeited after the Essex conspiracy, suggests that 'after 13 yeres servic and suit for *the* Revells, I may turne all my forces & frends to feed on *the* Rebells'. This was written in connexion with a second petition to the Queen, in which occurs the following passage :

'It pleased your Maiestie to except against Tentes and Toyles. I wishe, that ffor Tentes I might putt in Tenementes : soe should I bee eased with some Toyles ; some landes, some goodes, ffynes, or fforffeytures, that should ffall, by the just ffall of these most ffalce Traytours, that seeinge nothinge will come by the Revells, I may praye vppon Rebells. Thirteen yeares, your Highnes Servant, butt yett nothinge . . .'[1]

The general drift of these documents is fairly clear. It would seem that Lyly received promises of advancement from Elizabeth about 1585, probably as a result of the success of his plays ; that in 1588 he was 'entertained the queen's servant', with a more or less authorized expectation of place in the Revels ; that in 1597 his claims were set aside in favour of Buck ; and that, after unavailing protests, he made the best of the situation and attempted to obtain what compensation he could for his disappointment. I find some confirmation of the view that about 1588 Lyly came to be regarded, possibly on account of the aid rendered by his pen to the bishops against Martin Marprelate, as having some right of succession to a place at Court, in an allusion of Gabriel Harvey, who in his *Advertisement for Papp-Hatchett*, dated 5 November 1589, but not published until it was included in his *Pierce's*

[1] The letters are printed in full in Bond, *Lyly*, i. 64, 68, 70, 378, 392, 395. A contemporary note by Sir Stephen Powle to a copy of the 1601 appeal says, 'He was a suter to be Mr. of the Reuelles and tentes and Toyles, but eauer crossed'.

Supererogation of 1593, says of Papp-Hatchett, who is almost certainly Lyly, 'He might as truly forge any lewd or villanous report of any one in England; and for his labour challenge to be preferred to the Clerkship of the whetstone'; and again, 'His knavish and foolish malice palpably bewrayeth itself in most odious actions; meet to garnish the foresayd famous office of the whetstone'.[1] The actual phrasing of Lyly's letters is, of course, characteristically obscure. It is possible that the 'keper' referred to in the first of them is the Lord Keeper, Sir Thomas Egerton, to whom, if Collier may be trusted, Buck sent, in 1605, a copy of a poem called ΔΑΦΝΙΣ ΠΟΛΥΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ, with some lines referring to an obligation of long standing towards his patron.[2] The allusion to 'Tentes and Toyles' may mean that, after giving up hope of the Mastership of the Revels, Lyly had turned his thoughts to the Mastership of the Tents and Toils, the actual holder of which, in 1601, Henry Sackford, had been appointed to the Tents as far back as 1559, and must therefore have been an oldish man; or possibly that, if he could not have the higher place, Lyly would have been content with the reversion of one of the two subordinate appointments, the Clerkship or the Clerk Comptrollership, which the Revels shared with the Tents.[3]

I may complete the story by pointing out that Buck, no less than Lyly, was making interest with Cecil. As a connexion of the Howards, he had of course a powerful influence behind him, and after the death of Nicasius Yetswiert, French Secretary and Clerk of the Signet, Lord Howard of Effingham had written to Cecil on 28 April 1595[4]:

'In favour of Mr. Buck, whom Her Majesty, talking with Mr. John Stanhope, herself named, showing a gracious disposition to do him good, and think him fit, as sure he is, for one of the two offices of Mr. Necasius, that is called unto God's mercy. For the French tongue he can do it very well to serve her Majesty.'

Four years later, on 1 June 1599, Buck himself wrote to the Secretary[5]:

'I understood by a friend of mine, not many months since, that you were very well affected to mine old long suit, and of your own disposition offered to move the Queen in my behalf. Ever since I reckoned myself in your good favour till yesterday that I heard

[1] Grosart, *Harvey*, ii. 211. [2] Collier, i. 361.

[3] The conjecture of R. W. Bond (*Lyly*, i. 41) that Lyly was actually Clerk Comptroller is rendered untenable by our complete knowledge of the succession to that post; cf. *Tudor Revels*, 60, and Feuillerat, *Lyly*, 194, who shows that Lyly was the Queen's 'servant' as Esquire of the Body.

[4] *Hatfield MSS.* v. 189. [5] Ibid. ix. 190.

you had given your goodwill to another, and besides had persuaded one of my chiefest friends to be solicitor for him. My interest therein accrued out of frank almoin, and therefore I can claim no estate but during pleasure, yet I hoped, as other poor true tenants do, not to be turned out so long as I performed my honest duties.'

This may reasonably be taken as referring to the Mastership of the Revels, and makes it clear that, whatever Elizabeth had said or done in 1597, she had not given Buck any irrecoverable promise. Very likely she never did. But early in the new reign, on 23 June 1603, Buck received a formal grant by patent of the reversion to Tilney.[1] On the same day was issued a new commission for the office, similar to that of 1581, but in Buck's name instead of Tilney's, from which it is to be inferred that he had become the acting Master.[2] On 23 July 1603 he was knighted.[3] Tilney, however, continued to render the accounts, which, with two exceptions, only exist for the whole of the reign of James in a summary form. The account for 1609–10 is by Tilney's executor, Thomas Tilney; and from 1610–11 onwards Buck is accounting officer, and in full enjoyment of the Mastership.[4] One of the two detailed accounts is Tilney's for 1604–5, the other Buck's for 1611–12. These are made interesting by their schedules of Court performances, the authenticity of which may now be regarded as fairly vindicated.[5] They show that the establishment remained precisely upon its sixteenth-century lines. The close of Elizabeth's reign witnessed the termination by death of Blagrave's fifty-seven years' service in the Revels.[6] William Honing, the former Comptroller, returned to the Office as Clerk in his room, under a patent made retrospective to 25 March 1603.[7] He was still there, as was Edward Kirkham, the

[1] *Patent Roll, 1 Jac. I*, p. 24, m. 25; Text from seventeenth-century copy in *Dramatic Records*, 14; docquet, dated 21 June, in *S. P. D. Jac. I*, ii. p. 16. The terms, which follow those of earlier patents, are recited in the Declared Accounts of the Office from 1610–11 onwards.

[2] *Patent Roll, 1 Jac. I*, p. 24, m. 31. The date 1613 given by Chalmers, 491, is an error. An imperfect copy is in *Dulwich MS.* xviii. 5, f. 51 (Warner, 338). The docquet in *S. P. D. Jac. I*, ii. p. 16, is dated 21 June.

[3] Nichols, *James*, i. 215.

[4] He did not, however, get Tilney's fee of £100 (cf. p. 103) but only the original £10 (*Abstract* of 1617) or, according to some of the manuscript fee lists (*Stowe MSS.* 574, f. 16; 575, f. 22v), £20. Tilney's monument is in Streatham church (Lysons, *Environs*, i. 365) but does not give the exact date of his death.

[5] Cf. App. B.

[6] The pedigree in *Middlesex Pedigrees* (*Harl. Soc.* lxv), 83, dates his death in error 18 Jan. 1590, but it is interesting to note that his daughter Mary married William, brother of Thomas Lodge. He was buried at Clerkenwell.

[7] Patent in *Dramatic Records*, 9, dated 5 (? 15) June; docquet of 10 June in *S. P. D. Jac. I*, ii. p. 14; draft of 30 May in *S. P. D. Eliz. Addl.* ix. 58.

Yeoman, in 1617.[1] On the other hand there was a rather rapid succession of Clerk Comptrollers: Edmund Pakenham to 1605–6, Edmund Fowler from 1606–7 to 1608–9, William Page in 1609–10, and Alexander Stafford from 24 April 1611 to 1617 or later.[2] The Groom or Purveyor, like the Porter of St. John's, appears to have been a servitor and not an officer by patent. During 1603–15 he was Stephen Baile, who had succeeded Thomas Clatterbocke. The Porter of St. John's, during the same period, was Richard Prescot.[3]

The change of reign brought with it another change in the financial arrangements for the office. The 'composition' introduced by Burghley in 1597 was abandoned, and henceforth the Master regularly received an imprest of £100 at the beginning of each financial year, together with the balance due on an account rendered by him for all charges since the time of the last imprest. The total amount passing through his hands was not large. During the earlier years of the reign it varied from £150 to £300, and during 1611–15 from £300 to £500.[4] In 1617 the 'ordinary' issues for the Revels were still estimated at £300.[5] Nor was there any special need for 'extraordinary' issues, since the organization of the masks, in which Jacobean Court extravagance centred, was not entrusted to the Revels at all, but to some nominated officer, under the direct supervision of the Lord Chamberlain and the Master of the Horse, who received funds direct from the Treasury for any expenditure which did not fall within the provinces of the Wardrobe or the Office of Works.[6] The Revels Officers continued indeed to give their personal attendance on mask nights, and to charge for their diet accordingly. But their actual responsibility for the entertainments appears to have been limited to the supervision of the fittings, such as the 'music house' in the hall or banqueting-house, and in particular of the elaborate arrangements for lighting. The wire-drawer's bill is the chief outgoing represented in the annual accounts. There is very little else except the personal allowances for the officers and the Master's four servants, their office expenses and boat-hire, the audit and exchequer costs, and occasional repairs to the 'tiring-house' used for

[1] *Abstract*, 60.

[2] *Dramatic Records*, 63; *Accounts, passim.*

[3] *Accounts, passim.* Feuillerat, 475, names Thomas Cornwallis as Groom Porter in 1603. But there was no such post at the Revels. Cornwallis was Groom Porter of the Chamber.

[4] Cunningham, 209, 217; *Declared Accounts, passim*; *S. P. D. Jac. I*, x. p. 178; xxxi. p. 410; lviii. p. 652; lxii. p. 17; lxviii. p. 110; Collier, i. 347, 363; Devon, 118.

[5] *Abstract*, 8.

[6] Cf. ch. vi.

rehearsals and other parts of the premises which they occupied. The Master charges diet for himself and his men for every day between All Hallows and Ash Wednesday, together with an extra amount for each actual night of play or mask, and for a varying number of days of tilting and running at the ring and twenty days of 'airing' in the summer. The Comptroller, Clerk, and Yeoman get £13 6*s.* 8*d.* each and the Groom £6 13*s.* 4*d.* for the whole of their required attendance. Beyond a stray property or garment here and there, there is nothing spent on emptions of stuff or on tailors and the like. I think it is clear that the result of the policy initiated by Burghley had been to reduce the Revels, regarded as a branch of the Household organization, to comparative insignificance. Henceforward its domestic duties sink into the background of the quasi-political functions given to the Master as stage censor by the commissions of 1581 and 1603. But these functions were peculiar to the Master, who carried them out with the aid of his personal servants.[1] The other Revels officers had no claim to share in them, and though Tilney and Buck built up a considerable income out of licensing fees, which probably accounts for the discontinuance in Buck's case of the 'better recompense' of £100 granted by Elizabeth to Tilney, no penny of these fees ever passed through the Revels Accounts.

The slight increase of cost observable in course of time is mainly due to charges for lodgings. The want of accommodation at Hampton Court in the winter of 1603–4 obliged the officers to rent rooms at Kingston for a month at a cost of £4.[2] In 1607 a far more serious problem was presented by the impending loss of St. John's. This had remained in Crown hands throughout Elizabeth's time, although on 31 October 1601 we find John Chamberlain writing to Dudley Carleton, 'The Quene sells land still and the house of St. Johns is at sale'.[3] James, however, after leasing the Gatehouse for life to Sir Roger Wilbraham in 1604, carried out his predecessor's intention by selling the greater part of the

[1] Henslowe took receipts for licensing fees from Michael Bloomson, John Carnab, Robert Hassard, William Hatto, Robert Johnson, William Playstowe, Thomas and William Stonnard, Richard Veale, and Thomas Whittle, 'men' of the Master of the Revels, between 1595 and 1602. Johnson was of Leatherhead, where Tilney had a house. I regret to say that on one occasion Henslowe thought fit to make a loan to William Stonnard (Greg, *Henslowe*, i. 3, 5, 12, 28, 39, 40, 46, 54, 72, 83, 85, 103, 109, 116, 117, 121, 129, 132, 148, 160, 161; *Dulwich MSS.* i. 37).

[2] *Declared Account.*

[3] Chamberlain, 120. A proposal (*c.* 1589) for the establishment of an 'Accademye for the studye of Antiquitye and Historye' (*Anglia*, xxxii. 261) contains a suggestion that its library might be housed in St. John's.

Priory to Ralph Freeman on 9 May 1607.[1] Presumably the premises which had been assigned to the Revels were not covered by this sale, for of these the King made a gift in the same year to his cousin Esmé Stuart, eighth Lord Aubigny.[2] The Revels therefore had to be dispossessed. But the Office had to be housed somewhere; and the officers were all entitled to official residences under the terms of their patents. It was doubtless in connexion with this transaction that the following memorandum, which is preserved amongst Sir Julius Caesar's papers and endorsed 'Mr. Tilney's writinge touching his Office', was drawn up.[3]

The Office of *the* Revells Is noted to be one of *the* Kinges Ma*iestes* standinge Offices, as are the Jewellhowsse, *the* wardropp, *the* Ordinance, the Armorye, and the Tentes with *the* like Allowances everie wayes *that* any of *them* haue.

W*hich* Office of *the* Revells Consistethe of a wardropp and other severall Roomes for Artifficers to worke in (viz. Taylors, Imbrotherers, Properti makers, Paynters, wyerdrawers and Carpenters), togeather with a Convenient place for *the* Rehearshalls and settinge forthe of Playes and other Shewes for those Services.

In w*hich* Office *the* Master of *the* Office hath ever hadd a dwellinge Howsse for him self and his Famelie, and *the* other Officers ar to haue eyther dwellinge Howsses Assigned unto *them* by *the* Mas*ter* (for so goeth the wordes of *ther* Patten*tes*) or else a Rente for *the* same as *the*i had before they Came unto St. Johnes.

For by ther Pattents, w*hich* be all eyther new graunted or Confirmed by the King*es* Ma*iestie*, They ar Allowed as the Master Is to haue eache of them a dwellinge Howsse with garden and Stable for Terme of *ther* lyues, as ther Predicessors hadd (viz. within St. Johnes), w*hich* Cannot well be taken from vs without good Consideration for the same: or *the* lyke Allowance for Howssroome.

Elye Howsse Is possessed agayne by *the* Byshopp as I doe heare.

But Sir Thomas Knevitt hath vnder neathe his keepershipp of Whitehaull, dyvers howsses, as Hawnces and Baptistas with ij or iij howsses more Appertayninge ther vnto, near vnto *the* olde Pallas In westminster w*hich* I doe doubte be all rented out by him for Terme of his lyeffe.

The difficulty was met by a plan which had served before in the history of the Revels. The officers were allowed to provide their own lodgings, and to charge £15 each for the purpose in the Office account. A similar allowance (£20) was made

[1] *S. P. D.* (22. xi. 04); *1 London and Middlesex Arch. Soc. Trans.* iii. 157.

[2] The gift to Aubigny is recited in the Treasury warrants of 10 Nov. 1610 and 31 March 1611 for lodging allowances cited below.

[3] *Lansd. MS.* 156, f. 368.

to the Master for the provision of an office.[1] The actual removal, so far as the office was concerned, took place in the spring of 1608. The accounts show expenses 'in providing a place for th'office of the Revells' between 10 February and the middle of April, and there is independent evidence that on the 10th of March, it was located next door to the Whitefriars theatre.[2] Tilney's personal allowance first appears in the account for 1608–9, and is made retrospective to Michaelmas 1607. Perhaps the Clerk and Yeoman were not disturbed quite so soon. Their allowances first appear in 1610–11, and are retrospective to Hallowmas 1608.[3] It may be assumed that the Comptroller's lodging was treated as a charge on the Tents. On Tilney's death, Buck was allowed £30 to cover both the Office and his own lodging, and the payment antedated to Michaelmas 1608. He protested that he had in fact to pay a rent of £50, and although Salisbury probably turned a deaf ear, his appeal was allowed when his Howard connexions, Suffolk and Northampton, became Treasury Commissioners in 1612, and the allowance was finally fixed at £50.[4] It should be added that Buck also secured in 1612–13, and very likely in other years, a quite distinct allowance of £16, under a warrant from the Lord Chamberlain to the Treasurer of the Chamber, as compensation for the absence of a lodging for him at a crowded Court during the winter revels season.[5] The Office cannot have stayed long in the Whitefriars, for on 24 August 1612 Buck dedicated a treatise on *The Third University in England* to Sir Edward Coke 'from his Majesties office of the Revels, upon St. Peter's Hill'.[6] This is an account of the seats of learning in London,

[1] *S. P. D. Jac. I*, xxviii, p. 391. The authority was given by a privy seal.

[2] Cf. ch. xvii.

[3] Cunningham, xxi, from *Audit Office Enrolments*, ii. 108. The authority is a Treasury warrant to auditors of 10 Nov. 1910.

[4] *S. P. D. Jac. I*, lxv. 2, contains (i) a letter of 1 July 1611 from Buck to Salisbury's secretary, Dudley Norton, asking for authority to be given by privy seal and not a mere letter to the auditors, and enclosing (ii) a letter to Salisbury, putting his case and pleading that Tilney had £35, 'besides £100 for a better recompense', which had not been continued to Buck, (iii) a copy of a Treasury warrant to the auditors for the £30, dated 31 March 1611, and (iv) a draft of the privy seal asked for. Chalmers, 490, printed (ii) and (iii), and Cunningham printed a draft for (ii) from *Harl. MS.* 6850 in *Sh. Soc. Papers*, iv. 143. On 19 Dec. 1612 the Treasury sent a warrant to the auditors to allow the £50 (Cunningham, xxii). But Buck's preference for a privy seal was sound, for at a later date Auditor Beale complained that authority for the lodging allowances was wanting (*Dramatic Records*, 84; Herbert, 129).

[5] *Chamber Accounts*. Similar expenses for earlier years were charged in the *Revels Accounts*; cf. p. 89.

[6] There was yet another change later. Herbert said after the Restora-

and was printed by Howes as an appendix to the 1615 edition of Stowe's *Annales*. Chapter 47 is *Of the Art of Revels*, and is worth quoting:

'I might add herunto for a corollary of this discourse the Art of Revels which requireth knowledge in Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Philosophy, History, Music, Mathematics, and in other Arts (and all more than I understand I confess) and hath a settled place within this City. But because I have described it and discoursed thereof at large in a particular commentary, according to my talent, I will surcease to speak any more thereof: blazing only the Arms belonging to it; which are Gules, a cross argent, and in the first corner of the scutcheon, a Mercury's petasus argent, and a lion gules in chief or.'[1]

It is matter for deep regret that Buck's 'particular commentary' is lost. He made other contributions to letters, writing commendatory verses to Thomas Watson's ΕΚΑΤΟΜΠΑΘΙΑ (*c.* 1582) and to Camden's *Britannia* (1607), and a poem called ΔΑΦΝΙΣ ΠΟΛΥΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ (1605).[2] His *History of the Life and Reigne of Richard III* was published posthumously in 1607.[3]

Reversions of the Mastership were granted during Buck's lifetime to Edward Glasscock in 1603, to John, afterwards Sir John, Astley or Ashley on 3 April 1612, to Benjamin Jonson on 5 October 1621, and to William Painter on 29 July 1622.[4] His actual successor was Sir John Astley. On 30 March 1622 John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton, 'Old Sir George Buck, master of the revels, has gone mad'.[5] On 29 March 1622 a warrant was issued by the Lord Chamberlain to swear Astley in as Master, followed on 16 May by

tion (*Dramatic Records*, 39; Herbert, 108) that the Office had been 'time out of minde' in the parish of St. Mary Bowe, in the ward of Cheap. St. Peter's Hill is divided between Queen Hithe and Castle Baynard wards.

[1] Chalmers, *Apology*, 531, 628, has an engraving from a block of the Revels Office seal or stamp, as used by Thomas Killigrew under Charles II. It has Killigrew's arms with the legend 'Sigill: Offic: Iocor: Mascar: Et Revell: Dni: Reg.'

[2] Cf. p. 98. The verses to the *Britannia* are headed 'Georgij Buc Equitis aurati Reg[iorum] Sp[ectaculorum] C[uratoris] Heptastichon'.

[3] This is sometimes ascribed to a younger Buck, but the manuscript copy in *Cott. MS. Tiberius*, E. x, is dated from the Revels Office on St. Peter's Hill in 1619.

[4] Feuillerat, *Lyly*, 237; *Dramatic Records*, 11, 39; Herbert, 7, 102; *S. P. D. Jac. I* (cxxxii, p. 432). Chalmers, 492, says, 'Yet, this was not old Ben, as it seemeth, who died in 1637, but young Ben, who died in 1635'. This seems rather improbable. Was Jonson already a suitor for the post in 1601, when Dekker wrote *Satiromastix*, iv. 1. 244, 'Master Horace . . . I have some cossens Garman at Court, shall beget you the reuersion of the Master of the Kings Reuels, or else be his Lord of Misrule nowe at Christmas'?

[5] *S. P. D. Jac. I*, cxxviii. 96.

a letter requiring Buck to deliver up the books and other property of the Office.[1] His death took place on 20 September 1623.[2] Astley almost immediately sold his office to Sir Henry Herbert, whose tenure of it belongs to the history of the Caroline stage.

[1] Murray, ii. 193, from *Inner Temple MS.* 515; cf. Collier, i. 402; Gildersleeve, 64.
[2] Herbert, 67, 109.

IV

PAGEANTRY

[*Bibliographical Note.* A mass of material on the progresses is collected in J. Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth* (ed. 2, 1823) and *Progresses of James I* (1828), which may be supplemented by W. Kelly, *Royal Progresses and Visits to Leicester* (1884), and F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914). Most of the contemporary descriptions of entertainments reprinted by Nichols will be found noticed in chh. xxiii, xxiv, and a more complete itinerary than his is attempted in Appendix A with the help of the dates of Privy Council meetings and the accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, which he did not utilize. Most of the hosts of royalty can be identified with the aid of the *Victoria County Histories*, and of other local histories, to which some guide is afforded by J. P. Anderson, *Book of British Topography* (1881), of which a new edition is looked for, C. Gross, *Bibliography of Municipal History* (1897), and A. L. Humphreys, *Handbook to County Bibliography* (1917). Three of the most important home counties are described in J. Norden's *Middlesex* (1593), *Herts* (1598), and *Essex* (1840), and the main roads are surveyed at a date rather after the period in J. Ogilby, *Britannia* (1675), the progenitor of a long line of road-books.

On the Lord Mayor's show, J. G. Nichols, *London Pageants* (1837), and F. W. Fairholt, *Lord Mayor's Pageants* (1843–4) and *The Civic Garland* (1845), may be consulted; and further details can be gleaned from C. M. Clode, *Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors* (1875) and *Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors* (1888), and other publications of individual guilds.

Elizabethan hunting is dealt with by D. H. Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence* (1897). There is no adequate history of the dance; the chapter by A. F. Sieveking in *Shakespeare's England*, ii. 437, and the sources there cited may be consulted. The tilt has been recently dealt with by F. H. Cripps-Day, *The History of the Tournament* (1918), and R. C. Clephan, *The Tournament, Its Periods and Phases* (1919), which appeared after this chapter was written. Contemporary records are collected by W. Segar, *Honor Military and Civill* (1602), and armature is learnedly treated in J. Hewitt, *Ancient Armour and Weapons in Europe* (1855–60), and C. Ffoulkes, *Armour and Weapons* (1909).

R. Withington, *English Pageantry* (vol. i, 1918), also published since this chapter was written, deals more fully with the origins and mediaeval history of pageantry than with its Elizabethan examples.]

The tradition of pageantry had its roots deep in the Middle Ages. But it made its appeal also to the Renaissance, of which nothing was more characteristic than the passion for colour and all the splendid external vesture of things; while the ranging curiosity of the Renaissance was able to stimulate into fresh life the fading imaginative energies of the past, weaving its new fancies from classical mythology, from epic and pastoral, from the explorations of history and folk-lore,

no less delightfully than incongruously, into the old mediaeval warp of scripture and hagiology and allegory. So that the Tudor kings and queens came and went about their public affairs in a constant atmosphere of make-believe, with a sibyl lurking in every court-yard and gateway, and a satyr in the boscage of every park, to turn the ceremonies of welcome and farewell, without which sovereigns must not move, by the arts of song and dance and mimetic dialogue, to favour and to prettiness.

The fullest scope for such entertainments was afforded by the custom of the progress, which led the Court, summer by summer, to remove from London and the great palaces on the Thames and renew the migratory life of earlier dynasties, wandering for a month or more over the fair face of the land, and housing itself in the outlying castles and royal manors, or claiming the ready hospitality of the territorial gentry and the provincial cities. This was a holiday, in which the sovereign sought change of air and the recreation of hunting and such other pastimes as the country yields.[1] But it cannot be doubted that it had also a political object, in the strengthening, by the give and take of gracious courtesies, of the bonds of personal affection and loyalty upon which much of the wisdom of Elizabeth's domestic statecraft so securely rested. And accordingly the procedure retained much of the solemnity of a state function. The Queen went on horseback or in a coach or litter, attended by her bodyguards and the great officers of state, with the Master of the Horse leading her bridle and a great noble carrying the sword before her.[2] The sheriff met her at the boundary of each county, and as she entered a castle or a city the constables offered up their keys and the corporations their maces, and received them again at her hands. And with the Queen came the Household in a body, Hall and Chamber and Stable, followed by a long train of carts bearing the royal 'stuff' which was destined to supply the needs of the household offices, and to furnish

[1] Thomas Herbert to Robert Cecil, 26 Aug. 1601 (*Hatfield MSS.* xi. 362): 'Her Majesty, God be praised, liketh her journey, the air of this soil, and the pleasures and pastimes showed her in the way, marvellous well'; cf. p. 111 (1577). In March 1581, Thomas Scot reported to Leicester (*S. P. D.* cxlviii. 34) the scurrilous statement of one Henry Hawkins, 'that my Lord Robert hath had fyve children by the Queene, and she never goethe in progress but to be delivered'.

[2] Machyn, 262, 267, describes the start from and return to London in 1561. Puttenham, iii. 22 (ed. Arber, 266), has a story of Elizabeth's mirth at one Serjeant Bendlowes, 'when in a progresse time comming to salute the Queene in Huntingtonshire he said to her Cochman, stay thy cart good fellow, stay thy cart, that I may speake to the Queene'.

the often empty walls of temporary lodgings, where were reproduced, if only on a miniature scale, the conventional ordering of presence chamber, privy chamber, and the like, which were the essentials of a royal dwelling.[1] Careful arrangements had, of course, to be made in advance; on the one hand for the maintenance of communications with London and the transaction or postponement of business during the absence of Queen and Council, and on the other for the housing and provisioning of so great a multitude in the country districts.[2] The latter had of old been the care of a special group of Hall officers known as the Harbingers.[3] These still exercised functions of detail. But the general control, like so much else, had passed into the hands of the Lord Chamberlain. Early in the summer, as soon as the royal decision as to the direction and duration of the progress could be obtained, a document was drawn up, known as the 'gestes' or 'jestes', by which must be understood, I think, not a chronicle of *res gestae*, but a table of the 'gysts' or *gîtes* appointed for each night's lodging, which is what in fact it contained.[4] Copies of the 'gestes' were signed by the Lord Chamberlain and given with warrants from himself to Gentlemen Ushers of the Chamber, who took them as instructions to the mayors of towns, and doubtless also to the lord-lieutenants of counties, through which the progress would pass. The Ushers were directed to view and report upon the lodgings

[1] Hunsdon to Cecil, 31 Aug. 1599 (*S. P. D.* cclxxii. 94): 'She . . . will go more privately than is fitting for the time, or beseeming her estate; yet she will ride through Kingston in state, proportioning very unsuitably her lodging at Hampton Court unto it, making the Lady Scudamores lodging her presence chamber, Mrs. Ratcliffes her privy chamber.' James said of certain law courts, 'They be like houses in progress, where I have not, nor can have, such distinct rooms of state as I have here at Whitehall or at Hampton Court' (Bacon, *Apophthegms*, in *Works*, vii. 166). The distribution of rooms at Theobalds for a visit of 1572 is given in *Hatfield MSS.* xiii. 110.

[2] Dasent, vii. 238; viii. 401; x. 284, 286, 305.

[3] The Duchess of Suffolk wrote to Cecil in 1570 (*Hatfield MSS.* i. 481) to 'speak but one good word for me to the harbingers, in case my man shall not be able to entreat them to help me to some lodging near the court'. The harbingers, as in origin Hall officers, would provide for the Court generally; the Gentlemen Ushers of the Chamber for the Queen in person. A P. C. warrant of 29 June 1575 (Dasent, viii. 402) is for post-horses for Simon Boier, Gentleman Usher, 'being this progresse tyme appointed to prepare her Majesties lodginges' (cf. App. A, *Bibl. Note*).

[4] For references to the 'gestes', cf. 1 Ellis, ii. 274; Wright, ii. 16; Kempe, 266; Birch, *Eliz.* i. 87; Hunter, *Hallamshire*, 123. Copies of those for 1603 and 1605 are at the Heralds' College (Lodge, *App.* 97, 99, 108, 109). Those for 1605 are printed (from *Harl. MS.* 7044?) by Leland, *Coll.* ii. 626, and those for 1614, with the corporation's endorsement of receipt, from the Leicester archives by Nichols, *James*, iii. 10.

available.[1] The royal Waymaker studied the roads, and the Guard the security of the neighbourhood.[2] The local officials were required to see that a sufficient provision of food, drink, and fuel was secured, and to furnish that important safeguard, a certificate that their districts were free from the dangerous infection of the plague.[3] The 'gestes' were also published in the household, and individual courtiers hastened to send them to their friends, and to give advice to those scheduled as royal hosts about the kind of entertainment which the sovereign would expect. There is plenty of evidence in the private correspondence of the period that the honour of a royal visit was not anticipated without some anxieties. That of Sir William More at Loseley contains several references to the subject. There is a letter from Sir Anthony Wingfield, who tells More that he has reported to the Lord Chamberlain 'what fewe smal romes and howe unmete your howes was for the Quenes majesty'. She had decided to go to a manor-house of her own, but had again changed her mind. Wingfield had spoken to Lord Admiral Clinton, 'for that ytt shalbe a grete trouboul and a henderanes to you', and advises More to try his influence with Leicester. This must have been written before the present fine house at Loseley, built during 1562–8, was sufficiently completed to house the Queen. More, however, had a visit in 1567, and another in 1576, after which his neighbour, Henry Goringe of Burton, who expected one in 1577, wrote to ask him 'what order was taken by her Maiesties offycers at that tyme that her grace was with youe, and whether your howse were furnyshed with her highnes stufe, wyne, beer, and other provycion, or that you purveyd for the same or any parte thereof'. He had a third in 1583, of which he was warned by Sir Christopher Hatton in a letter of 4 August, directing him to see everything well ordered, and the house 'sweete and cleane'. There had been a 'brute' of infection, but this was now reported as 'a misinformation'. On 24 August, Hatton wrote again. More should 'avoyd' his family, and make everything ready 'as to your owne discretion shall seeme most needefull for her maiesties good

[1] A survey of houses for a progress in Herts is in *S. P. D.* cxxv. 46.

[2] *Hatfield MSS.* v. 19, 309; vii. 378.

[3] Kelly, *Progresses*, 302, 319, 345, 360; Nichols, *James*, iii. 11; Wright, ii. 16; Howard, 211. A 'Remembrance for the Progress' of 1575 (*Pepys MS.* 179) contains elaborate notes for routes (not those ultimately followed) and mileage, for the provision of vehicles, for instructions to sheriffs about corn and hay, and justices about flesh, fish, and fowl, for the carriage of wine from London, and the brewing of beer locally. If the country ale doesn't please the Queen, a London supply must be provided, or a brewer taken down.

contentation'. The sheriff was not to attend her on this occasion, but More and some other gentlemen had better meet her in Guildford. Finally, he had one in 1591, and one Mr. Constable came with a letter from Lord Hunsdon, asking for More's help in selecting suitable lodgings on the way to Petworth or Cowdray.[1] To these letters can be added others from various sources. In 1572 Sir Nicholas Bacon wrote to Burghley from Gorhambury that he understood 'by comen speche' that the Queen was coming, and being uncertain of the date and desirous to 'take that cours that myght best pleas her maiestie', begged for advice 'what you thinke to be the best waye for me to deale in this matter: ffor, in very deede, no man is more rawe in suche a matter then my selfe'.[2] Only a few days later Burghley also had a letter from the Earl of Bedford, then on his way to Woburn Abbey to make preparations. He wishes his rooms and lodgings were better, and says, 'I trust your Lordship will have in remembraunce to provide and helpe that her Maiesties tarieng be not above two nights and a daye; for, for so long tyme do I prepare'.[3] In the following year, 1573, it was the turn of Archbishop Parker to be both flattered and perturbed by the intimation of a visit to Canterbury. He can lodge the Queen, he tells Burghley, and also, at any rate 'for a progresse-tyme', the Treasurer himself, the Chamberlain, Leicester, and Hatton, 'thinking that your Lordships will furnisshe the places with your owne stuffe'. The house, indeed, was 'of an evill ayer, hanging upon the churche and having no prospect to loke on the people: but yet, I trust, the convenience of the building would serve'. Possibly the Queen would prefer 'her owne pallace at St. Austens', and the lords could go to the dean and prebendaries, several of whom have offered to take Burghley. In any case he would wish to dine the Queen, and the nobles and her train in 'my bigger hall'. Meanwhile he will write to the Lord Chamberlain on some things that concern his office.[4] In 1577 it was the Lord Chamberlain himself, the Earl of Sussex, who received a touching appeal from Lord Buckhurst for 'some certenty of

[1] Kempe, 265. Wingfield's letter is only dated 2 Aug.; Lord Clinton, who is named, became Earl of Lincoln in May 1572. More preserved a letter of 5 Aug. 1567 from William Lord Howard to the Mayor of Guildford, asking for a close to graze his horses in during the Queen's visit to the town. On 24 Aug. 1576 a Mr. Horsman wrote to More (Nichols, ii. 7), ''Tis thought the Queen will not come to your house this summer'.

[2] 1 Ellis, ii. 265.

[3] Ibid. 266. In 1570 Bedford had written to urge on Cecil the unsuitability of Chenies for the Queen (*Hatfield MSS.* i. 477).

[4] 1 Ellis, ii. 267.

the progres, yf it may possibly be'. Will the Queen come to Lewes, and if so, for how long? All the provision in Kent, Surrey, and Sussex is already taken up by the Earl of Arundel, Viscount Montagu and others, and he will have to send over to Flanders. Unless the Queen will 'presently determin', he does not see how he can perform that 'which is du and convenient'. And may it please God 'that the hous do not mislike her; that is my cheif care'. Apparently Buckhurst, like More a decade earlier, was building, for he adds, 'But yf her Highness had taried but on yere longer, we had ben to to happy; but Gods will and hers be doon'.[1] Sussex, though called upon to advise others, had his own subjects for reflection. He had offered the Queen hospitality at New Hall, apparently at short notice on some change of programme, and she replied that 'it were no good reason and less good manners' to trouble him. In forwarding her message Leicester had added, perhaps maliciously, for there was no love lost between him and Sussex, 'Nevertheless, my lord, for mine own opinion, I believe she wil hunt, and visit your house, coming so neer. Herein you may use the matter accordingly, since she would have you not to look for her.' Attempts were being made to dissuade her from having a progress at all, 'But it much misliketh her not to go some wher to have change of air', and the progress was 'most like to go forward, since she fancieth it so greatly herself'.[2] However, there was a good deal of plague about, and in the end the progress was abandoned, doubtless to the relief of both Sussex and Buckhurst. Perhaps the most amusing letter of all, in its delicate attempt to balance deprecation with loyalty, is one written by Sir William Cornwallis to Walsingham in 1583, on behalf of the Earl of Northumberland at Petworth. The earl wished to learn 'as much certeinty as he can' of the expected visit, and after mentioning 'the shortness of the tyme' for provision and the illness of Lady Northumberland, Cornwallis continues, 'Notwithstanding, Sir, this is very trew, yet it may not be advertysed, lest it might be thought to give impediment to her Majesties coming, wherof I perceyve my lord very glade and desirous'. Finally he ventures a discreet hint on his own account, fearing that 'her Majestie will never thank him that hath perswaded this progreyse, nor those lords that shall receive her, how great entertaynment soever they give her, considering the wayes by which she must come to them, up the hill and down the hill, so as she shall not be able to use ether coche or litter

[1] Ibid. 271. [2] Ibid. 272.

with ease, and those ways also so full of louse stones, as it is carefull and painfull riding for anybody, nether can ther be in this cuntrey any wayes devysed to avoyd those ould wayes. In truth, Sir, thus I find it, and I wyshe some others knew it, so I wear not the author; who though I write it for care of the Queen, yet might it be interpreted otherwise.'[1] Northumberland had at this time good reason to be diplomatic. Probably he was already under Walsingham's suspicion, and before the end of the year he was in the Tower, for his participation in the Throgmorton plot. Against all this uneasiness may be set the genuine spirit of welcome and personal affection for the Queen which appears to have prevailed in the much visited household of Lord Norris of Rycote. Leicester reports to Hatton in 1582 his own 'piece of cold entertainment' at the hands of Lady Norris, because he and Hatton 'were the chief hinderers of her Majesty's coming hither, which they took more unkindly than there was cause indeed'. Inverting Cornwallis's plea, he had alleged 'the foul and ragged way' as an excuse, and adds as his comment, 'A hearty noble couple are they as ever I saw towards her Highness'.[2]

Much additional inconvenience was evidently caused to voluntary and involuntary hosts alike by the characteristic indecision which led Elizabeth, in small things as well as great, to be constantly chopping and changing her plans. The 'gestes' might be set down, but they were never final, to the last minute. The good city of Leicester was warned four times to make preparation, in 1562, 1575, 1576, and 1585, and never had the felicity of beholding its sovereign at all.[3] The point comes out clearly enough in the letters already quoted; perhaps even more clearly in a final group written in August 1597 by one of Burghley's secretaries, Henry Maynard, from London to another, Michael Hicks, who was in fluttered anticipation of a visit at Ruckholt in Essex. Maynard wrote three times in the course of five days. On the 10th he warned Hicks to expect the Queen in the following week, 'if the iestes hold, which after manie alteracions is so sett downe this daie'. He will let him know if

[1] *Sussex Arch. Collections*, v. 194.

[2] Nicolas, *Hatton*, 269. Lady Norris, to whom Elizabeth wrote affectionately as her 'crow', was the daughter of Lord Williams of Thame, who had befriended her as a prisoner at Woodstock; on the Rycote entertainment of 1592, cf. p. 125.

[3] Kelly, *Progresses*, 296. On 6 July 1576 Gilbert Talbot wrote to Lord Shrewsbury (Lodge, ii. 75): 'There hath been sundry determinations of her Majesty's progress this summer. . . . These two or three days it hath changed every five hours.'

there is any further change, 'for wee are greatlie aferd of Theobalds'. On the 12th there had been no change as yet and Hicks had better come to court for advice. There was still danger of Theobalds, 'but as yett it is not sett downe'. With a sigh, Maynard adds, 'This progresse much trowbleth mee, for that we knowe not what corse the Queen will take'. On the 15th he can at last announce that no change was now expected. He had told the Lord Chamberlain that Hicks was troubled at the insufficient accommodation he could provide for the royal train. 'His awnsweare was that you weare unwise to be at anie such charge: but onelie to leave the howse to the Quene: and wished that theare might be presented to hir Majestie from your wief sum fine wastcoate, or fine ruffe, or like thinge, which he said would be acceptablie taken as if it weare of greate price.' Maynard was still anticipating a descent on Theobalds, although nothing had been said about it.[1] As a matter of fact, his anticipation was justified, and Theobalds was visited in the course of September. In 1599 there was a scare lest the short progress planned should be extended, 'by reason of an intercepted letter, wherein the giving over of lòng voyages was noted to be sign of age'.[2]

Contact with the great is not ordinarily, for the plain man, a bed of roses; and there is no reason to suppose that it was otherwise in the spacious times of Elizabeth. You probably got knighted, if you were not a knight already, which cost you some fees, and you received some sugared royal compliments on the excellence of your entertainment and the appropriateness of your 'devices'. But you had wrestled for a month with poulterers and with poets. You had 'avoided' your house, and made yourself uncomfortable in a neighbouring lodge. You had seen your trim gardens and terraces encamped upon by a locust-swarm of all the tag-rag and bobtail that follows a court. And with your knowledge of that queer streak in the Tudor blood, you had been on tenterhooks all the time lest at some real or fancied dislike the royal countenance might become clouded, and the compliments give way to a bitter jest or to open railing. 'I have had hitherto a troublesome progress,' writes Cecil to Parker in 1561, 'to stay the Queen's majesty from daily offence conceived against the clergy, by reason of the undiscreet behaviour of the readers and ministers in these countries of

[1] 1 Ellis, ii. 274.

[2] Sir Charles Danvers to the Earl of Southampton (*Hatfield MSS.* ix. 246). For other letters of courtly deprecation, which I have no room to quote, cf. Hatton, 223; *Hatfield MSS.* v. 19, 299, 309.

Suffolk and Essex.'[1] Parker himself was something of a favourite with Elizabeth, yet John Harington can record an incredible insult to his wife on the doorstep of Lambeth.[2] And Richard Topcliffe, hunter of recusants, describes with indecent glee how the hospitality of Edward Rookwood in 1578 was rewarded with a committal to prison and a public obloquy on his religion.[3] The arrogance of the royal train had always to be reckoned with. As far back as 1526 Henry VIII had issued a formal household order against the spoliation of houses in progress.[4] In 1574 Leicester instigated

[1] *Parker Correspondence*, 148.

[2] Harington, ii. 16, 'She gave him very speciall thanks, with gratious and honorable tearms, and then looking on his wife; "and you (saith she) *Madam* I may not call you, and *Mistris* I am ashamed to call you, so I know not what to call you, but yet I do thanke you".'

[3] Lodge, ii. 119: 'This Rookwood is a Papist of kind newly crept out of his late wardship. Her majesty, by some means I know not, was lodged at his house, Ewston, far unmeet for her Highness, but fitter for the blackguard; nevertheless (the gentleman brought into her Majesty's presence by like device) her excellent Majesty gave to Rookwood ordinary thanks for his bad house, and her fair hand to kiss; after which it was braved at. But my Lord Chamberlain, nobly and gravely understanding that Rookwood was excommunicated for Papistry, called him before him; demanded of him how he durst presume to attempt her real presence, he, unfit to accompany any Christian person; forthwith said he was fitter for a pair of stocks; commanded him out of the Court, and yet to attend her Council's pleasure; and at Norwich he was committed. And, to decipher the gentleman to the full; a piece of plate being missed in the Court, and searched for in his hay house, in the hay rick such an image of our Lady was there found, as for greatness, for gayness, and workmanship, I did never see such a match; and, after a sort of country dances ended, in her Majesty's sight the idol was set behind the people, who avoided. She rather seemed a beast raised up on a sudden from hell by conjuring, than the picture for whom it had been so often and long abused. Her Majesty commanded it to the fire, which in her sight by the country folks was quickly done, to her content, and unspeakable joy of every one but some one or two who had sucked of the idol's poisoned milk.' Rookwood's committal and release are recorded in the P. C. Acts (Dasent, x. 310, 312, 342). He suffered at a later date as a recusant and died in gaol. His cousin, Ambrose Rookwood of Stanningfield, was a Guy Fawkes conspirator (*D. N. B.*; Dasent, xxv. 118, 203, 252, 371, 419 Copinger, *Manors of Suffolk*, i. 292).

[4] *H. O.* 145: 'It is often and in manner dayly seene, that as well in the kings owne houses, as in the places of other noblemen and gentlemen, where the kings Grace doth fortune to lye or come unto, not onely lockes of doores, tables, formes, cupboards, tressells, and other ymplements of household, be carryed, purloyned, and taken away, by such servants and others as be lodged in the same houses and places; but also such pleasures and commodities as they have about their houses, that is to say, deer, fish, orchards, hay, corne, grasse, pasture, and other store belonging to the same noblemen and gentlemen, or to others dwelling neere abouts, is by ravine taken, dispoiled, wasted and spent, without lycence or consent of the owner, or any money paid for the same, to the kings great dis-

a surprise visit to Berkeley Castle, which was not in the 'gestes', and so ruined the head of deer by killing twenty-seven in one day that Lord Berkeley in a passion disparked the estate. This appears to have been a deliberate scheme by Leicester to bring Berkeley into disfavour and secure the castle himself.[1] The Stuart households were probably just as bad. After Anne's visit in 1603, the Leicester corporation had to pursue the court 'aboute lynnyns and pewter that was myssinge'.[2]

It is not quite clear how far these annoyances were aggravated by the financial burden of the royal entertainment. There is some evidence that, so far as the essentials of food and drink and fuel were concerned, the household was prepared to pay its way, and that, although the hosts had to make provision of these necessaries, they were entitled to recoupment for the cost by the Cofferer.[3] Certainly the progress, once an economy for the Crown, had become an expense.[4] Burghley's papers contain an estimate, based on the accounts of 1573, showing an 'increase of chardgies in the time of progresse' to the extent of £1,034, 'which should not be if her Majestie remeynid at her Standing Howses within xx myles of London'.[5] This is not wholly conclusive, because in any case part of the time was usually spent, not in private houses, but at royal manors or even in inns.[6] But

honour, and the no little damage and displeasure of those to whose houses the Kings Highnesse doth fortune to repaire . . .'

[1] 1 Ellis, ii. 277, evidently misdated 'ann. 15' for 'ann. 16'.

[2] Kelly, *Progresses*, 325.

[3] The Cofferer's Account for the progress of 1561, printed in Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 92, from *Cott. Vesp.* C. xiv, shows expenditure while the court lay or dined at several private houses. On 24 July 1560 Sir N. Bacon wrote to Parker, 'The Queen's majesty meaneth on Monday next to dine at Lambeth; and although it shall be altogether of her provision, yet I thought it meet to make you privy thereto, lest, other men forgetting it, the thing should be too sudden' (Parker, 120). This was a dinner on a remove from Greenwich to Richmond, not during a progress; but the principle was probably the same. The older practice was certainly for the crown to pay. Puttenham, iii. 24 (ed. Arber, 301), records that Henry VII, 'if his chaunce had bene to lye at any of his subiects houses, or to passe moe meales then one, he that would take vpon him to defray the charge of his dyet, or of his officers and houshold, he would be maruelously offended with it, saying what priuate subiect dare vndertake a Princes charge, or looke into the secret of his expence?' And the discreet courtier adds, 'Her Maiestie hath bene knowne oftentimes to mislike the superfluous expence of her subiects bestowed vpon her in times of her progresses'.

[4] Cf. p. 17.

[5] 1 Ellis, ii. 265, from *Lansd. MS.* 16, f. 107.

[6] In 1576 the Board of Green Cloth paid £3 6*s.* 8*d.* by way of 'rewards given to inns in progress time where her majesty hath been' (Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 48).

its indication is confirmed, so far as civic visits are concerned, by entries in corporation accounts, which appear to be limited to expenditure upon the hire or purchase of plenishing, the repair of streets and pavements and painting of gates and public buildings, the provision of a fairly costly gift in the form of a gold cup with money in it, and the payment of fees to the queen's waymaker for inspecting the roads, and to various officers of the chamber, hall, and stable. The visit of 1575 cost the city of Worcester £173, raised partly out of corporation funds, partly by a special levy. The city of Leicester met that of 1612 with a levy of £74 1*s.* 9*d.*, while that of 1614 cost them £102 12*s.* 6½*d.*[1] Anything in the way of a mimetic entertainment would probably fall by civic custom on the guilds.[2] And the establishment of the Revels, which followed the progress, was ready to help at need, with a mask or banqueting house.[3] There are definite statements as to the recoupment of the cost of light, rushes, and fuel at Oxford in 1566, and of beer when Prince Charles passed through Leicester in 1604.[4] Of course, the Crown used its feudal right of purveyance; that is to say, of purchase within the verge at rates fixed by itself; and for this purchase a local jury was empanelled to assist the Clerk of the Market in drawing up a tariff and supervising weights and measures.[5]

[1] Kelly, *Progresses*, 298, 320, 345, 359; Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 551.

[2] At Coventry in 1566 'The tanners pageant stood at St. Johns Church, the drapers pageant at the Cross, the smiths pageant at Little Park Street End, and the weavers pageant at Much Park Street' (H. Craig, *Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, xxi, misdated 1567; cf. ibid. 106).

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 105, 109, 118, 130, 182, 225, shows that the Revels followed the progresses of 1559, when they furnished a banqueting house and mask at Horsley; of 1566, when their expenses came to £187 8*s.* 11½*d.*; of 1571, when the Master took nine men, three horses and a wagon; of 1573, when they spent £21 10*s.* 8*d.* on carriage and apparently the mask at Canterbury; and of 1574, when they furnished the Italian players at Windsor and Reading. A Green Cloth document of 1576 (Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 50) also records the expenditure of £109 1*s.* 11*d.* by the Woodyard on 'necessaries, as plancks, boards, quarters, tressets, forms, and carpenters, hired in time of progresses'. Another of 1604 (Nichols, *James*, i. xi) is a record of wood felled to furnish the king's house with fuel during the recent progress.

[4] *Ch. Ch. Accts.* 1566 (Boas, 107), 'to the clerkes of the greene clothe for unburdeninge at our requeste the universitie & us of the lightes & rushes iij payre of gloves . . . xviij^{s} . . . to the yeoman of the woodyarde for helpinge us to a recompence of our woode & cole spent . . . x^{s}'. Kelly, *Progresses*, 328, 'for the which you shall have satisfaction'.

[5] Kelly, *Progresses*, 361, prints the precept for the jury at Leicester in 1614. Jacobean proclamations (*Procl.* 950, 994, 1096, 1098, 1135), regulating the functions of the Clerk of the Market, claim that local prices, especially on progress, are often extortionate. Nichols, *Eliz.* iii. 252, prints a memorandum of Puckering's for Elizabeth's intended visit in 1594, which contemplates 'purveyed diet'.

But the abuses of purveyance, which included the impressment of vehicles by the royal cart-takers, cannot have borne very heavily upon districts rarely visited, although the home counties, which were more often traversed and contained standing houses, had no doubt their grievances.[1]

The Hicks correspondence suggests that, even in 1597, the household was still prepared to provision itself, at any rate in the smaller private houses. But there is a good deal of evidence to show that, where persons of wealth were concerned, a different practice grew up. A visit to Gorhambury in 1577 cost Sir Nicolas Bacon £577.[2] Parker's son recorded that his father's entertainment of the Queen at Canterbury and other houses, with his gifts to her and the lords and ladies, cost him above £2,000, and that in addition he spent £170 at Canterbury in rewards to the officers of the household.[3] Burghley's domestic biographer tells us that the twelve visits to Theobalds cost him 'two or three thousand pounds every tyme', which sufficiently explains why his adherents were not particularly anxious for a visit in 1597.[4] Parker had to find many nights' lodging, as the Queen passed up and down stream, and at Canterbury Elizabeth is known to have occupied a house of her own. But Burghley's heavy expenditure must surely have covered more than the mere gifts and the spectacular side of his entertainments. A visit to the Marquis of Winchester in 1601 was 'with more charge than the constitution of Basing may well bear'.[5] For that to Harefield in 1602 the bills are preserved, and amount to £2,013 18*s.* 4*d.*, of which £1,255 12*s.* 0*d.* was apparently for

[1] On the history of purveyance in general, the protests of Jacobean parliaments, and the attempts to persuade the shires to accept 'compositions', cf. Gardiner, i. 170, 299; ii. 113; Cheyney, i. 29; Bray in *Archaeologia*, viii. 329; Nichols, *James*, i. x; Kempe, 272; *Procl.* 1033. Nichols prints a table of *c.* 1604 showing the proportion of carts, 220 in all, charged on each of eight counties at removes from Richmond, Windsor, Hampton Court, Nonsuch, or Oatlands. The king paid 2*d.* a mile and required not more than twelve miles a day. A Green Cloth order of 1609 limits the charge on the bailiwick of Surrey (in Windsor Forest) to eight carts on a remove from Windsor or other houses in the bailiwick, or from Easthampstead, to Hampton Court, Oatlands, Richmond, or Farnham. The household officers were accused of blackmailing owners of carts to avoid impressment, and of requisitioning superfluous provisions and reselling them at a profit. In 1605 the Venetian ambassador reported (*V. P.* x. 267, 285) that James's servants were under less good control than Elizabeth's, and that the longer time now spent in the country and more frequent removes aggravated the burden of purveyance. The carts were wanted for harvest. Moreover, hunting destroyed the crops.

[2] Birch, *Eliz.* i. 12.

[3] Parker, xii.

[4] Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, 25.

[5] Thomas Tooke to John Hubbard (Goodman, ii. 20).

provisions, £199 9*s.* 11*d.* for temporary buildings, and the balance presumably for gifts, spectacles, and the like. There is no indication of any repayments by the royal Cofferer, although Sir Thomas Egerton's friends came nobly to his assistance, and sent in innumerable presents, including no less than eighty-six stags and bucks, eleven oxen, sixty-five sheep, and forty-one sugar-loaves, as well as birds, fish, oysters, Selsea cockles, cheese-cakes, sweetmeats, wine, wheat, and salt.[1] Finally we have the definite statement of the French ambassador La Mothe Fénelon in 1575, that at Kenilworth Leicester 'a deffrayé toute la court a cent soixante platz d'assiette, l'espace de douze jours'.[2] And we have that of the Venetian ambassador Foscarini in 1612, that 'his Majesty's charges are borne by the owners of the houses where he lodges'. Foscarini had accompanied the progress to Belvoir, and was much struck with the large numbers, more than a thousand, who were housed there, and with the costly style in which things were done, 'far exceeding that of the court when in London or a neighbouring palace'. He found personally, as others have found since his day, that visiting was much more expensive than staying at home, on account of the largesse expected.[3] I am inclined to think that we have come here upon a point of honour, and that, while it was not in theory incumbent upon a poor man to feed as well as lodge his mistress, it gradually became customary for rich men to give a special proof of their devotion by omitting to claim the recoupment to which they were strictly entitled. And if this was so, of course in the long run the poor men had to follow suit. Sir William Clarke in 1602 was counted a churl, for he 'neither gives meat nor money to any of the progressors. The house Her Majesty has at commandment, and his grass the guard's horses eat, and this is all.'[4] The right to occupy the house of a subject was indeed a matter of feudal tradition. All manors were ultimately held of the Crown. We find Elizabeth dating from 'our manor of Cheneys' in 1570, although Chenies had long been in the hands of the Russells; and it was an *obiter dictum*

[1] *Egerton Papers*, 340. The second of the documents there printed is one of Collier's forgeries. On 27 April 1603 Sir Robert Cecil wrote to Egerton (*Egerton Papers*, 369) to borrow some plate, 'because of my self I am not able to furnish my house at Theobalds of all such necessarys as are convenient for his Maiestys reception without the helpe of my frends'.

[2] La Mothe, vi. 478. Gossip said that Leicester's magnificence was in return for an 'octroy de quelques vaquanz' worth 200,000 crowns.

[3] *V. P.* xii. 409.

[4] Northumberland to Cobham (*S. P. D.* cclxxxiv. 97).

of Lord Northampton in a Star Chamber case of 1606 that 'the kinge by his prerogative may take vp any howse in his progres'.[1]

Those who accompanied the progress had their own woes to bear. There was a good deal of 'roughing it'. The rate of advance, at ten or twelve miles a day, broken by a dinner at some wayside mansion or in a temporarily constructed 'dining house', was inevitably slow. The weather and the roads were often unkind; nor was the advance guard of two hundred and twenty carts carrying baggage likely to have mended the condition of the latter.[2] The numbers were great, and if accommodation was scant, some had to make shift with tents and booths. The commissariat was not always perfect. Even the Queen might come off badly. On one occasion Leicester reported to Burghley that the beer had been unsatisfactory. 'Hit did put her very farr out of temper, and almost all the company beside.' Happily, a better brew had been discovered. 'God be thanked she is now perfectly well and merry.'[3] Burghley himself was apparently timed to join the progress at Dudley, and he received a discreet hint from Walsingham that a change of programme would bring the Queen there earlier than had been expected, 'whereuppon your Lordship may take some just cause to excuse you not coming thither'.[4] No doubt Burghley's duties as Lord Treasurer often kept him at Westminster. But the fact is that the sixteenth-century growth of luxury was making a migratory court something of an anachronism.[5] The progress was by no means always on the same scale of elaboration. In some years it was limited to a month or so in the counties nearest to London; in others it extended over three or four months, and the Queen went fairly far afield. During the earlier years the most important progresses were those of 1564 and 1566, which included visits to Cambridge and to Oxford respectively. In 1562, 1563, and 1565 there were no progresses at all, owing to plague or other reasons. The period of the great progresses was the second decade of the

[1] Wright, i. 370; Hawarde, 311.

[2] Nichols, i. 601, prints from *Lansd. MS.* 16, 'The Q. Prayer after a Progress, Aug. 15 [1574] being then at Bristow'. It contains a thanksgiving for 'preseruinge me in this longe and dangerus jorneye'.

[3] Kelly, *Progresses*, 301, from *Harl. MS.* 6996. The letter is undated, but as the court was going to Kenilworth, it may belong to 1575.

[4] Wright, ii. 16.

[5] 'I am old, and come now evil away with the inconveniences of progress. I followed her Majesty until my man returned and told me he could get neither fit lodging for me nor room for my horse,' writes Sir Henry Lee in 1591 (*Hatfield MSS.* iv. 136).

reign; and it culminated in the 'Princely Pleasures' of Kenilworth of 1575. During 1572, 1574, and 1575 Elizabeth covered a large part of the Midlands; during 1573 Kent and Sussex; during 1578 East Anglia. She reached Southampton in 1560 and 1569, Dover in 1573, Bristol in 1574, Stafford and Chartley in 1575. Farther north or west I do not find her; visits were planned to the chief towns of the Presidencies of Wales and of the North, to Shrewsbury in 1575 and to York in 1584, but these never came off. Progresses were practically suspended during the troublous decade before the Armada, when the Queen's life was hardly ever safe from plots, and she generally spent the autumn quietly at Oatlands or Nonsuch. In 1591 and 1592 the old custom was revived; Southampton was revisited in the former year, Oxford and the Cotswolds in the latter. There was another revival towards the end of the reign, and there were short progresses in 1597, 1600, 1601, and 1602. Two unsuccessful plans were made to get as far as Wiltshire. Elizabeth's strength was failing, but the restlessness of her latter years was upon her, and she would not have it said that she was too old to travel. She had to reckon, however, with courtiers who had learnt to love their ease. 'The Lords are sorry for it,' wrote Rowland White to Sir Robert Sidney, when she determined to set out from Nonsuch in 1600, 'butt her majestie bids the old stay behind, and the young and able to goe with her. She had just cause to be offended, that at her remove to this place she was soe poorely attended; for I never saw so small a train.'[1] At all times, and particularly during the later years, the formal progresses were supplemented by short visits of a few days, or even a few hours, to favoured courtiers, sometimes by way of a 'by-progress' in spring or autumn, sometimes in the course of a remove from one standing house to another, sometimes merely to relieve a continuous residence at the same palace.[2] Several of the twelve visits to Theobalds, for which Elizabeth had evidently a liking, and which had been rebuilt to accommodate her, were by progresses. The household did not always accompany her on these occasions. Within London itself, she also occasionally paid a visit. In the last winter of her life, several entertainments were carefully arranged for her, in the hope of keeping her at Whitehall.[3] In 1601 and 1602 she went a-Maying at Highgate

[1] *Sydney Papers*, ii. 210.

[2] Walsingham wrote to Shrewsbury from Oatlands on 2 Sept. 1584 (Lodge, ii. 245), that the Privy Council was divided 'by reason of a little by progress her Majesty hath made for her recreation'.

[3] Chamberlain, 166, 169, 'All is to entertain the time, and win her to

and Lewisham. Another day's visit, probably of 1600, is elaborately described by Sir Robert Sidney to Sir John Harington.[1]

With the arrival of James and his horde of hungry Scots, and the setting-up of supernumerary establishments for Anne and the royal children, the progress became a more unwieldy institution than ever. During the greater part of 1603 the court was abroad. The triumphal descent of the King in April and May was practically a progress. So was that of Anne in June. There was a regular progress in August and September, and the prevalence of plague compelled the prolongation of this throughout the autumn, until the weary court sank into its winter quarters at Christmas. A groan went up to Lord Shrewsbury from Robert Lord Cecil at Woodstock, which he found an 'unwholesome' and 'uneaseful' house, not able to lodge more than the King and Queen, the privy chamber ladies, and some three or four of the Scottish Council. 'Neither Chamberlain, nor one English counsellor have a room, which will be a sour sauce to some of your old friends that have been merry with you in a winter's night, from whence they have not removed to their bed in a snowy storm.' The plague was driving the court up and down. 'God bless the king, for once a week one or other dies in our

stay here if may be'. . . . 'These feastings have had their effect to stay the Court here this Christmas, though most of the cariages were well onward on theire waye to Richmond.'

[1] Harington, i. 314: 'Her Highness hath done honour to my poor house by visiting me, and seemed much pleased at what we did to please her. My son made her a fair speech, to which she did give most gracious reply. The women did dance before her, whilst the cornets did salute from the gallery; and she did vouchsafe to eat two morsels of rich comfit cake, and drank a small cordial from a gold cup. She had a marvelous suit of velvet borne by four of her first women attendants in rich apparel; two ushers did go before, and at going up stairs she called for a staff, and was much wearied in walking about the house, and said she wished to come another day. Six drums and six trumpets waited in the court, and sounded at her approach and departure. My wife did bear herself in wondrous good liking, and was attired in a purple kyrtle, fringed with gold; and my self, in a rich band and collar of needle-work, and did wear a goodly stuff of the bravest cut and fashion, with an under body of silver and loops. The Queen was much in commendation of our appearances, and smiled at the ladies, who in their dances often came up to the stepp on which the seat was fixed to make their obeysance, and so fell back into their order again. The younger Markham did several gallant feats on a horse before the gate, leaping down and kissing his sword, then mounting swiftly on the saddle, and passed a lance with much skill. The day well nigh spent, the Queen went and tasted a small beverage that was set out in divers rooms where she might pass; and then in much order was attended to her palace, the cornets and trumpets sounding through the streets.'

tents.'[1] In the same strain wrote Levinus Muncke a little later to Winwood from Wilton of 'these arrant removes', in which 'we endure misserie apace and want of all things, which I never thought the country so unable to supply us'.[2] Nevertheless, James maintained the tradition, and devoted a month or two in each year to a progress, which, but for the occasional presence of the queen or prince, and the attendance, not quite invariable, of the council and household, did not differ much in character from his far more frequent hunting journeys. His direction was generally determined by the existence of hunting facilities, and such districts as the New Forest, Wychwood and Sherwood Forests, and Salisbury Plain figure again and again in the 'gestes'. He had reached Southampton and even the Isle of Wight in 1603, and probably repeated his visit in 1607 and 1611. He also touched the sea at Lulworth in 1615. He visited Oxford from Woodstock in 1605 and Cambridge twice during hunting journeys in 1615. Anne made an independent progress to the west, for the sake of the Bath waters, in 1613, and got as far as Bristol.

We have had sufficient peeps behind the court arras to give a pleasantly sub-acid flavour of irony to the effusive accounts of royal receptions contained in official chronicles, or in the semi-official narratives of poets who were anxious to preserve the memory of the verses and devices contributed by themselves.[3] These in their turn enable us to recapture something of whatever rapture the rather artless forms of *mimesis* employed may have awakened in Renaissance breasts; although of course the few devices of which details have reached us are but a tithe of those on whose fantasy and grace the dust of oblivion has for centuries lain thick. It was naturally at the visits to private houses that the spirit of sheer entertainment had fullest scope, and a glance at the diaries for Kenilworth in 1575 or for Elvetham in 1591 will show the variety of pastime which ministered spectacle to the eyes and flattery to the self-esteem of Oriana on her holidays. The visit to Kenilworth extended over three weeks. The Queen arrived on 9 July and was greeted with speeches by Sibylla, by a porter as Hercules, and by the Lady of the Lake, and that she might not forget that she was a scholar, with a Latin speech by a Poet. July 10 was a Sunday, and

[1] Lodge, iii. 38. [2] Winwood, ii. 155.

[3] Many of the numbers in the song-books of the madrigalists and lutenists probably had their origin in entertainments. *The Triumphs of Oriana* (1601), for example, may have been written as a whole for a royal birthday or maying; cf. also examples in Fellowes, 121, 328, 434, 464, 485.

after divine service there was a display of fireworks. On 11 July the Queen hunted, and on her return listened to an out-of-door dialogue between a Savage Man—the mediaeval folk-personage known as the 'wodwose'—and the classical Echo. July 12 was a day of rest, and 13 July was again devoted to hunting. On 14 July came a bear-baiting, another display of fireworks, and acrobatic feats by an Italian. After two days' interval, the sports began again on 17 July, with country shows of a bride-ale, a quintain, and the Coventry Hock-Tuesday play.[1] This was followed in the evening by a play and banquet. A mask was held in readiness, but not used. On 18 July, after a hunt, came the principal show, an aquatic one of the Delivery of the Lady of the Lake, with the classical Arion riding on a dolphin; and the Queen held an investiture, and 'touched' poor folk for the 'evil'. On 19 July the Coventry show was repeated, and by this time the weather had broken up, and the royal zest for spectacles was perhaps exhausted. A projected show of Zabeta and a device of an ancient minstrel were laid aside, and the final week was uneventful, until the departure on 27 July after a show in farewell by Silvanus. All this was described, for the benefit of such of the Queen's lieges as had not the fortune to be present, in a printed narrative by George Gascoigne, who shared with William Hunnis of the Chapel Royal the main responsibility for the mimetic devices, and in another, racy and full of vivid detail, by one Robert Laneham, keeper of the council chamber door, who was in attendance as an officer of the household.[2] The entertainment at the much shorter visit to the Earl of Hertford at Elvetham in Hampshire, sixteen years later, was on very similar lines. The house was small, and a temporary 'room of estate' and other buildings had been constructed in the park, near an artificial pond, containing a Ship Isle, a Fort, and a Snail Mount. The Queen was greeted on arrival with a Latin speech by a Poet, and a ditty by the Graces and the Hours. A salute was fired from the pond. After supper there was a concert with a pavane by Thomas Morley. On the second day, after the Countess had made her offering in the morning, there was a great water-show on the pond, with Silvanus and the sea-gods Neptune, Oceanus, Nereus, and Neaera, which served to introduce further gifts. On the third day Elizabeth was awakened with a pastoral song of Phyllida and Corydon. After dinner there was an exhibition game of 'board and cord', which must have been a very close anticipation of

[1] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 154.

[2] Cf. ch. xxiv.

lawn-tennis, and in the evening a banquet in the garden and a display of fireworks. On the fourth morning came Aureola, the fairy queen, with a round of dancing fairies, and as the Queen departed there were Nereus and Sylvanus and their companies at the pond, the Hours and Graces weeping, a speech from the Poet dressed in black, and a farewell ditty at the park gate.[1] I have set the Kenilworth and Elvetham entertainments side by side, partly to illustrate the permanence of type, and partly because, if any actual sea-maid and fireworks gave Shakespeare a hint for Oberon's famous speech in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, it must surely have been those which were comparatively fresh in the memories of his hearers.[2]

The medley of Kenilworth and Elvetham repeats itself elsewhere; nor is the imaginative range a very wide one. Classical, romantic, pastoral, and folk-lore elements blend in quite sufficient congruity. The pagan divinities called upon are the out-of-door ones, Pan and Ceres at Bisham, Apollo and Daphne at Sudeley; and these, with the Nymphs (Orpington, Cowdray, Harefield) and Satyrs (Harefield, Althorp), may make easy acknowledgement of fundamental kinship with Aureola or Queen Mab and the native fairies (Woodstock, Norwich, Hengrave, Althorp) and woodwoses (Cowdray, Bisham). So, too, the rustic revelry of morris or country dance (Warwick, Cowdray, Althorp, Wells) or the choosing of the Cotswold Queen (Sudeley) passes readily enough into the manner of the formal pastoral, as we find it in Sidney's *Lady of the May* (Wanstead) or his sister's later dialogue of *Thenot and Piers*; which in turn have their affinities to the mediaeval *débat*, surviving in the dialogue of Constancy and Inconstancy (Woodstock), and in the 'contentions' of Sir John Davies between a Gentleman Usher and a Poet, and a Maid, a Wife, and a Widow.[3] To a modern taste, perhaps the most attractive entertainments are the simple ones in which the Gardener and the Mole-catcher or the Bailiff and the Dairymaid offer the naïve welcome of the

[1] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[2] *M. N. D.* II. i. 148:

> 'Thou rememb'rest
> Since once I sat upon a promontory,
> And heard a mermaid on a dolphin's back
> Uttering such dulcet and harmonious breath,
> That the rude sea grew civil at her song,
> And certain stars shot madly from their spheres,
> To hear the sea-maid's music.'

On the chronology, cf. *Sh. Homage*, 154.

[3] On the *débat*, cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 79, 187; ii. 153, 201.

rustic folk, or those to which the circumstances of place and time give something of a personal touch; as at Theobalds, where the hermit's cell typifies the temporary retirement of Burghley from public life, or at Rycote, where messengers bring in letters and jewels from sons and daughters of the house in Ireland, Flanders, France, and Jersey. Only fragments are preserved of the Harefield entertainment in 1602, but here a delicate fancy must have governed the devices, suggesting, for example, the presentation of a robe of rainbows on behalf of St. Swithin, and the personification of Harefield itself as Place 'in a partie-colored robe, like the brick house', accompanied by Time 'with yeollow haire, and in a green roabe, with an hower glasse, stopped, not runninge'. Here, too, was repeated the pretty notion of Elvetham, and at the royal departure there was Place again 'attyred in black mourning aparell', to bid farewell. In many instances the *mimesis* is so contrived as to lead to the introduction of the gift, which we may gather from the Hicks correspondence to have been looked upon as an obligatory rite of hospitality. The frugal and ostentatious soul of Elizabeth loved gifts; but James is said, at any rate on his first coming, to have thought it the more kingly part to decline them.[1] The mimetic entertainment itself, indeed, seems to have lost something of its vogue with the change of reign; possibly the King was less tolerant than his predecessor of pedantries other

[1] *V. P.* x. 25. Leicester left the Queen by will in 1588 (*Sydney Papers*, i. 71) a 'Jewel with three great Emrodes with a fair large Table Diamond in the middest, without a foyle, and set about with many Diamonds without foyle, and a Roape of fayre white Pearl, to the number six Hundred, to hang the said Jewel at; which Pearl and Jewel was once purposed for her Majesty, against a Coming to Wansted'. Rowland Whyte says of the visit to Lord Keeper Puckering at Kew in 1595 (*Sydney Papers*, i. 376), 'Her Intertainment for that Meale was great and exceeding costly. At her first Lighting, she had a fine Fanne, with a Handle garnisht with Diamonds. When she was in the Midle Way, between the Garden Gate and the Howse, there came Running towards her, one with a Nosegay in his Hand, deliuered yt vnto her, with a short well pened speach; it had in yt a very rich Iewell, with many Pendants of vnfirld Diamonds, valewed at 400l at least. After Dinner, in her Privy Chamber, he gaue her a faire Paire of Virginals. In her Bed Chamber, presented her with a fine Gown and a Juppin, which Things were pleasing to her Highnes; and, to grace his Lordship the more, she, of her self, tooke from him a Salt, a Spoone, and a Forcke, of faire Agate'. Of the visit to the Earl of Nottingham in 1602, Chamberlain, 169, writes, 'The Lord Admiralls feasting the Quene had nothing extraordinarie, neither were his presents so precious as was expected; being only a whole suit of apparell, whereas it was thought he wold have bestowed his rich hangings of all the fights with the Spanish Armada in eightie-eight'. These hangings were bought by James at the Princess Elizabeth's wedding in 1613 (*Abstract*, 15; *V. P.* xii. 499) for £1,628, and were long preserved in the House of Lords.

than his own. There are, of course, the three Sibyls at Oxford in 1605, which are said to have given a hint for *Macbeth*, and the amazing Queen of Sheba show in 1606, which has been preserved for us by the wicked wit of Sir John Harington.[1] And there are three examples from the pen of Ben Jonson, to whose ingenuity and learning the *genre* made a natural appeal, and who had the art to give dramatic life and point even to such trifles. These are the *Satyr*, with which Lord Spencer welcomed Anne and Henry at Althorp in 1603, the *Penates*, written when James, like Elizabeth before him, went a-Maying with Sir William Cornwallis at Highgate in 1604, and the graceful Theobalds entertainment, in which the Genius of the house, first weeping for the loss of his master, and then consoled by Mercury, Good Event, and the Parcae, made symbolical delivery of it to the Queen on its exchange by Lord Salisbury with James for Hatfield in 1607.

The civic entertainments naturally followed more formal lines than those in private houses. The citizens rode in their official gowns of black or scarlet. There was a learned oration by the recorder, and very likely also by the schoolmaster or a promising scholar of the grammar school. In a cathedral town there was divine service to be attended in state. The gift was no fantastic trifle, but a solid cup with angels in it. The *mimesis*, too, was of a more old-fashioned type. Mercury or a nymph might be there, but there were also the traditional pageants of the guilds, bearing their scenes from the miracle plays, or more modern allegories, or representations of local history and industry. At Coventry, in 1566, stood the Corpus Christi cars of the Tanners, Drapers, Smiths, and Weavers.[2] The variegated Norwich entertainment of 1578 included a speech by King Gurgunt, a pageant of the Commonwealth, with local craftsmen working at their looms, and a pageant of the City of Norwich, with Deborah, Esther, Judith, and Queen Martia.[3] Even as late as 1613, it was with scriptural pageants, curiously contaminated with intrusive classical themes, that the citizens of Wells greeted Queen Anne when she visited them from the Bath. The Hammermen furnished the Building of the Ark, Vulcan, Venus, and Cupid, and part of St. George; the Tanners, Chandlers, and Bakers, St. Clement and his Friar, part of Actaeon and Diana, and 'a carte of old virgines' in hides; the Cordwainers Saints Crispin and Crispinian; the Tailors Herodias and John Baptist; and the Mercers the remaining parts of St. George and of Actaeon and Diana. Three morrises also accompanied

[1] Cf. ch. vi, p. 172. [2] Cf. p. 116. [3] Cf. ch. xxiv.

the pageants.[1] George Ferebe's shepherd's song, as the Queen had crossed the Wansdyke at Bishop's Cannings, two months before, had struck a more up-to-date note.

In the university cities, municipal eloquence was redoubled by that of public orators and professors. The sovereign was expected to attend sermons and the academic exercise of disputations, and perhaps to wind up the latter with a Latin speech. The spectacles generally took the form of regular plays in Latin and occasionally in English. As the academic drama lies rather aside from the main purpose of this book, I confine myself to a brief chronicle. Elizabeth's first and only visit to Cambridge was from 5 to 10 August 1564.[2] The plays took place in the chapel of King's College, since the hall had been found unsuitable, and the two provided by the University were directed by Dr. Roger Kelke, the Master of Magdalene, with the aid of five others, one of whom was Thomas Legge of Trinity, himself a dramatist. On Sunday, 6 August, the *Aulularia* of Plautus was given by actors selected from colleges other than King's. Courtiers ignorant of Latin were wearied, but Elizabeth sat through the three hours' performance without sign of fatigue. On 7 August came *Dido*, a Latin tragedy by Edward Halliwell, formerly Fellow of King's, and on 8 August *Ezechias*, an English comedy by Nicholas Udall, who was an Oxford man. Both these plays were performed by King's men and both are lost. Elizabeth's patience was now exhausted, and she gave some disappointment by declining to hear a Latin translation of the *Ajax Flagellifer* of Sophocles, which men of various colleges had been appointed to give on 9 August. A contemporary letter from the Spanish ambassador gives an account of a singular epilogue to the royal visit. On 10 August Elizabeth had made her farewells, picking out Thomas Preston of King's for special favour on account of his performances both in the disputation and as an actor in *Dido*, and had reached the next stage in her progress, Sir Henry Cromwell's at Hinchinbrook.

[1] Nichols, ii. 673; *V. P.* xiii. 36; *Hist. MSS.* i. 107.

[2] There are four narratives: (*a*) MS. by Matthew Stokys, the University Registrary, printed by Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 151, and from a transcript in *Harl. MS.* 7037 (*Baker MS.* 10) and with a wrong ascription to N. Robinson, by Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii. 259; (*b*) Anon. in *Camb. Univ. Library MS.*, Ff. v. 14, f. 87, printed by Nichols, i. 183; (*c*) Abraham Hartwell (of King's), *Regina Literata* (1565), reprinted by Nichols, *Eliz.*[1] (1788), i; (*d*) Nicholas Robinson (of Queen's), *Commentarii Hexaemeri Rerum Cantabrigiae actarum*, printed by Nichols, *Eliz.*[1] iii. 27. The ascription of *Dido* to Halliwell is due to Hatcher's biographies of King's men in *Bodl. Rawl. MS.* B. 274. Hartwell gives some analysis both of *Dido* and of *Ezechias*.

Hither she was pursued by some of the scholars with what appears to have been a mask, originally intended to serve as an afterpiece to the *Ajax Flagellifer*. They were allowed to present it, but it proved to have been conceived in a spirit unsuited to the colour of the Queen's Protestantism, and gave considerable offence. It was, in fact, a burlesque of the Mass.[1] Two years later, from 31 August to 6 September 1566, it was the turn of Oxford.[2] The plays were in Christ Church Hall, and in them the University had the assistance of Richard Edwardes, formerly Student of Christ Church, and now Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal. At the first, a Latin prose comedy called *Marcus Geminus*, on 1 September, the Queen was not present. But she attended Edwardes's *Palamon and Arcite*, an English play in two parts, given on 2 and 4 September, and expressed high appreciation of the play and the acting. The fact that three persons were killed by the fall of a wall near the entrance door was not allowed to interfere with the representation.[3] She also attended James Calfhill's

[1] I borrow from Boas, 383, De Silva's description to the Duchess of Parma as given in Froude's transcript (*Addl. MS.* 26056 A, f. 237) of the original in the Simanças archives. There is a translation in *Sp. Papers*, i. 375. Froude, vii. 205, paraphrases the story. After premising that during the Queen's visit ' they wished to give her another representation, which she refused in order to be no longer delayed ', and that, ' those who were so anxious for her to hear it followed her to her first stopping-place, and so importuned her that at last she consented ', De Silva continues, ' Entráron los representantes en habitos de algunos de los Obispos que estan presos ; fué el primo el de Londres [Bonner] llevando en las manos un cordero como que le iba comiendo, y otros con otras devisas, y uno en figura de perro con una hostia en la boca. La Reyna se enojó tanto segun escriben que se entró á priesa en su camara diciendo malas palabras, y los que tenian las hachas, que era de noche, los dexáron á escuras, y assí cesó la inconsiderada y desvergonçada representaçion.' Of course, there is nothing about this in the academic narratives. It was an indecent proceeding, but in view of the character of the *farsa* or mummery which enlivened Elizabeth's first Christmas (cf. ch. v), the misunderstanding of her taste is perhaps explicable.

[2] There are five narratives : (*a*) *Twyne MS.* xvii, f. 160, in the University archives, by Thomas Neale, Professor of Hebrew, used by A. Wood, *Hist. of Oxford*, ii. 154, and Boas, 98 ; (*b*) Richard Stephens, *A Brief Rehearsall*, a summary of (*a*), printed by Nichols, *Eliz.*[1] i. 95, and C. Plummer, *Elizabethan Oxford*, 193 ; (*c*) *Twyne MS.* xxi. 792, by Miles Windsor of Corpus ; (*d*) Nicholas Robinson (of Queens', Cambridge), *Of the Actes done at Oxford*, printed from *Harl. MS.* 7033, f. 142, by Nichols, i. 229, and Plummer, 173 ; (*e*) John Bereblock (of Exeter), *Commentarii de Rebus Gestis Oxoniae*, printed by T. Hearne (1729) and Nichols, *Eliz.*[1] i. 35, and from *Bodl. Addl. MS.* A. 63, by Plummer, 113, and translated by W. Y. Durand in *M. L. A.* xx. 502. Bereblock gives full analyses of the plays. Boas, 106, adds extracts from a Christ Church account of the expenditure.

[3] Bereblock (Plummer, 128) says, ' Hoc malum quamvis potuit com-

Latin tragedy *Progne* on 5 September. The plays were all written by Christ Church men, but the actors appear to have been drawn in part from other colleges. John Rainolds of Corpus, afterwards a bitter opponent of the academic stage, played Hippolyta in *Palamon and Arcite*.[1] All the plays are unfortunately lost. The Spanish ambassador reported that there had been nothing about religion in them, and delivered himself of the compliment, 'Memorabilia profecto sunt Oxoniensium spectacula'.[2] More deserving, more felicitous, or less audacious than Cambridge, Oxford received the honour of a second royal visit in 1592.[3] It lasted from 22 to 28 September.[4] The plays, given on 24 and 26 September, were Leonard Hutten's *Bellum Grammaticale* and Gager's *Rivales*. Both performances were at Christ Church, but probably actors from other colleges took part. A jaundiced Cambridge visitor described them as 'but meanely performed'. Elizabeth, however, was gracious, and before departing 'schooled' John Rainolds, who had recently been fulminating against Gager,

munem laetitiam contaminare, nihilominus tamen eandem commaculare non potuit. Ad spectacula itaque omnes, alieno iam periculo cautiores, revertuntur'.

[1] Cf. Boas, 106, 390.

[2] *Sp. Papers*, i. 578; cf. Boas, 385.

[3] Sometimes the Chancellor brought distinguished foreign visitors, who were entertained with plays. In May 1569 Thomas Cooper, Vice-Chancellor and Dean of Christ Church, wrote to Leicester (*Pepys MSS.* 155), proposing 'a playe or shew of the destruction of Thebes, and the contention between Eteocles and Polynices for the governement therof', for a projected visit on 15 May by Odet de Coligny, Cardinal de Châtillon, and asking help 'for provision for some apparaile' (not 'apparaiti', as the *Hist. MSS.* report on the *Pepys MSS.* has it). It is not certain that the visit actually took place (Boas, 158). But in 1583 Leicester brought Albertus Alasco, Prince Palatine of Siradia in Poland, who saw the *Rivales* and *Dido* of William Gager (q.v.) on 11 and 12 June. The plays were given at Christ Church by men of that and other colleges, with the assistance of George Peele (Boas, 179, from Holinshed and academic archives). In Jan. 1585 Leicester came again, with Pembroke and Philip Sidney, and saw Gager's *Meleager* at Christ Church, and possibly also a comedy at Magdalen. Apparel was borrowed from John Lyly, who was then connected with the Blackfriars theatre (Boas, 192, from academic archives).

[4] There is only one narrative, by Philip Stringer (of St. John's, Cambridge), printed by Nichols, *Eliz.*[1], and Plummer, 245. Wood, *Hist. of Oxford*, ii. 248, follows an independent source. Boas, 252, makes some additions from academic archives, and cites from *Twyne MS.* xvii, f. 174, an order that 'the schollers which cannot be admitted to see the playes, doo not make any outcries or undecent noyses about the hall stayres or within the quadrangle of Christchurch, as usually they were wont to doo'. This was repeated at the visit of 1605. John Sanford's *Apollinis et Musarum Eidyllia*, reprinted by Plummer, 275, contains verses laudatory of the various guests.

for ' his obstinate preciseness '. It was, perhaps, as a result of the mirth shown at Oxford, that both Universities were invited to produce English plays at Court during the following Christmas. This, however, Cambridge at any rate declined to do, giving as their excuse the shortness of time, but more particularly the customary limitation of their academic plays to the Latin tongue.[1] There is no evidence, and little probability, that Oxford were any more amenable.

James passed through the outskirts of Oxford in 1604, but plague deferred his formal visit until 1605, when he came with the Queen and Henry, and stayed from 27 to 31 August.[2] As he came down St. Giles', he was greeted from St. John's with Matthew Gwynne's device of the *Tres Sibyllae*. The plays were in Christ Church hall, and apparel was hired from the King's Revels company in London. Inigo Jones, ' a great traveller ', was employed to furnish special machinery for changing the scenes, but opinions differed as to his success, and also as to the extent to which the King kept awake during the performances. Of these there were four. On 27 August a piece, variously named *Alba* and *Vertumnus*, and written in part by Robert Burton, was acted by Thomas Goodwin and other Christ Church men.[3] On 28 August actors from various colleges gave an *Ajax Flagellifer*, not apparently a translation from Sophocles, but an independent play. On 29 August St. John's men gave a play by Gwynne, also called *Vertumnus, sive Annus Recurrens*. These three, of which only the last survives, were in Latin. On 30 August, for the sake of the ladies, the fourth play, again by men of various colleges,

[1] *M. S. C.* i. 198, from *Lansd. MS.* 71, f. 204.

[2] There are four narratives : (*a*) Anthony Nixon, *The Oxford Triumph* (1605, S. R. 19 Sept. 1605) ; (*b*) Isaac Wake, *Rex Platonicus, sive Musae Regnantes* (1607) ; (*c*) a Cambridge report, probably by Philip Stringer, printed from *Harl. MS.* 7044, by Leland, *Coll.* ii. 626, and Nichols, i. 530 ; (*d*) a letter from John Chamberlain in Winwood, ii. 140. F. S. Boas and W. W. Greg (*M. S. C.* i. 247) print schedules of the apparel and necessaries obtained from Kirkham and Kendall of the Queen's Revels, and from one Matthew Fox. They were partly for *The Queen's Arcadia*, partly, I think, for *Ajax Flagellifer*, and partly for *Alba*. Provision was made for a magician, and ' those scenes of the Magus ', for which Robert Burton tells his brother (Nichols, iv. 1067) that he was thanked by Dr. King, Dean of Christ Church, were presumably in *Alba*. This is Stringer's name for the first play. Wake calls it *Vertumnus*, but it is clear from his analyses that it is distinct from Gwynne's, which he calls *Annus Recurrens*. Stringer's rather critical narrative contrasts with the self-complacency of the Oxford writers. He tells us how bored the King was and how the Queen and the ladies disliked the almost naked man in *Alba*.

[3] Goodwin's performance was made an excuse for securing the King's recommendation for his election as a Student of Christ Church (*S. P. D. Addl. Jac. I*, xxxvii. 66, 67, 70).

was in English. It was Daniel's *Arcadia Reformed*, afterwards published as *The Queen's Arcadia*. The King was not present on this occasion. It is a little surprising that he did not visit Cambridge until 1615. He had been preceded by Henry, who was there with the Elector Palatine in 1613, and saw performances by Trinity men in their college hall of Samuel Brooke's *Adelphe* and *Scyros* on 2 and 3 March respectively.[1] James went from Royston, and stayed from 7 to 11 March 1615.[2] The plays, given in Trinity College hall, were successively Edward Cecil's Latin *Aemilia*, by St. John's men, which is lost, Ruggle's *Ignoramus*, by men from Clare Hall and other minor colleges, and Tomkis's *Albumazar* and Brooke's *Melanthe*, both by Trinity men. King's had prepared Phineas Fletcher's *Sicelides*, but the King did not stay long enough to hear it. The visit evoked an outburst of satirical verses, both from Oxford and from the lawyers, who were stung by the wit of *Ignoramus*, with which the King was so pleased that, after a vain attempt to get the actors to Whitehall, he paid another visit to Cambridge, and saw it again on 13 May.[3] In March 1616 Cambridge men played before him at Royston; the name of the play is not known.[4] Oxford did not get its chance again until 1618, which falls outside the scope of this record.

The opportunities for spectacular display, which provincial towns enjoyed during a progress, fell to London chiefly at the time of a coronation, when on the day before the actual ceremony the sovereign passed in state from the Tower to Westminster, through the principal streets of the city which claimed to be, in a special sense, the royal

[1] Birch, i. 214; Winwood, iii. 441; Nichols, iv. 1087, from Hacket's *Life of Williams*.

[2] Birch, i. 303; Stowe, *Annales* (1631), 1023; *Hardwicke Papers*, i. 394; *Truth Brought to Light*, 64; Nichols, iii. 43. The names of the plays are given in a MS. *penes* Sir Edward Dering, printed by S. Pegge in *Gent. Mag.* (May 1756) and Hawkins, *Ignoramus*, xxx. I adopt the dates of this MS., which fit better into James's movements than the 12–15 March suggested by Chamberlain's letter in Birch, i. 303. The Vice-Chancellor ordered 'that noe Graduate of the Universitie under the degree of Master of Arts, or fellow-commoner, presume to come into the streets neare Trinity Colledge in the tymes the Comedyes are actinge; or after the Stage-Keepers be come forth; nor that any Schollar or Student, but those onely before excepted, by any meanes presume or attempte to come within the said Colledge or Hall to heare any of the said Comedyes'.

[3] Birch, i. 360, 361; Hawkins, *Ignoramus*, cxix, from a narrative by James Tabor, Registrary.

[4] Birch, i. 395, 397. Can the play have been *Susenbrotus*, for which there seems no room in the visit of 1615, although the MS. claims a performance before James and Charles at Trinity in '1615'?

'Chamber'.[1] The outstanding architectural features of these streets, St. Paul's, the gates at Ludgate and Temple Bar, the conduits in Cornhill and Fleet Street, the great and little conduits, the Standard, and the Cross in Cheapside, were recognized stations for music, speechifying, and pageantry. At some of them temporary arches, adorned with symbolical devices and hung with verses, spanned the highway. When Elizabeth started, in a slight snow-storm, on 14 January 1558, the City companies, in their black and red hoods, lined both sides of the way from Fenchurch to the Cross. The Queen, a coronetted and golden figure, rode in a litter, surrounded by her train of pensioners bearing their axes, and yeomen of the guard in their scarlet liveries with the Tudor rose and crown upon their backs. Behind came the Master of the Horse, leading a white hackney, and the Lords of the Council.[2] There were seven pageants, each with its verses in English or Latin and a child for interpreter. At the first, on a scaffold near Fenchurch, the child delivered a speech of welcome. At the upper end of Gracechurch Street was an arch bearing 'The Uniting of the two Houses of Lancaster and York'; at the Cornhill conduit another, with 'The Seat of Worthy Governance'; at the great conduit a third, with 'The Eight Beatitudes'. The first bore representations of Henry VII, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth herself; the other two allegorical figures of the morality type. At the Cross stood the Mayor and Aldermen, with a speech by the Recorder, and a thousand marks in a purse. At the little conduit was the fourth and principal arch, with sterile and green mounts symbolizing 'A Ruinous and a Flourishing Commonweal'; and Time and Truth presented the Queen as she went by with an English Bible. At the door of the school in St. Paul's Churchyard, a boy of Colet's foundation delivered a Latin speech. At the Fleet Street conduit was 'Deborah, with her Estates, consulting for the good Government of Israel'. At St. Dunstan's church was another speech by a child of the hospital. And finally, at Temple Bar stood those ancient folk-figures and palladia of the City, without whose beneficent presence no holiday could be complete, the giants Gotmagot and Corineus.[3] When James was crowned on 25 July 1603, a state entry on the traditional lines was planned, but when the arches were already up it was decided that the risk of plague was too great, and the ceremony was put off, first to the

[1] The term recalls the old use of the *Camera* as a treasury; cf. ch. ii. Similarly Bristol claimed to be the 'chamber' of a queen consort; cf. the patent to the Children of Bristol (ch. xii).

[2] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[3] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 172.

opening of a parliament contemplated in October, and ultimately to the following spring.[1] It took place on 15 March 1604. Jonson, Dekker, and Middleton were employed to furnish verses and devices, and the structure of the five pageants provided by the City was entrusted to Stephen Harrison, a joiner.[2] There were three additional ones, of which two were contributed by the Italian and Dutch traders in London, and the third, erected outside the City boundary, by the City of Westminster and the Savoy Liberty. The Venetian ambassador was perhaps prejudiced in reporting that the Italian pageant excelled the others in design and workmanship. But all the pageants, although they were enlivened by speeches and songs, for which the services of trained actors were enlisted, appear to have relied more upon architectural embellishment and less upon allegorical symbolism than those of 1559.[3] The order was as follows: At Fenchurch were the Genius of London and Thamesis, impersonated by Edward Alleyn of the Prince's men and a boy from the Queen's Revels; at the Exchange the Dutch and Italian arches, in neither of which a definite theme is traceable; at Soper Lane end 'Arabia Britannica', with a speech by a Paul's choir-boy and the song 'Troynovant is now no more a city'. In Cheapside stood once more the civic dignitaries, with a speech by the Recorder and three cups of gold for the King, Queen, and Prince. At the Cross were Sylvanus and Vertumnus, with the 'Garden of Eirene and Euporia'. In Paul's Churchyard the choristers sang, and a boy from the grammar school was ready with his Latin. The pageant at Fleet conduit, where William Borne of the Prince's had a speech as Zeal, represented the 'Globe of the World'; that at Temple Bar the 'Temple of Janus'; that of Westminster and the Savoy in the Strand the Rainbow, Sun, Moon, and Pleiades. Jonson seems to have been responsible

[1] *V. P.* x. 64, 67, 74; Birch, i. 8, 9. Chamberlain wrote to Carleton (10 July 1603), 'Our pageants are pretty forward, but most of them are such small timbered gentlemen that they cannot last long, and I doubt, if the plague cease not the sooner, they will rot and sink where they stand.' The double preparation must have cost the City something. There was a levy, amounting to £12 10*s.* on some of the guilds, in 1603, and in February 1604 another £400 had to be raised 'for the full performance and finishing of the pageants'. Towards this the Carpenters paid £2, but in all they had to pay an additional £8 3*s.* 4*d.* in 1604. There must have been protests, for the wardens of the Brewers were imprisoned for refusing to pay a levy of £50 (Jupp, *The Carpenters*, 68, 294; Young, *The Barber-Surgeons*, 110; Williams, *The Founders*, 222).

[2] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[3] Dekker sadly records that a great part of the speeches was left unspoken, lest they should be tedious to James.

for the devices at Fenchurch, Temple Bar, and the Strand; Dekker for those at Soper Lane and the Cross; Middleton for at any rate a part of that in Fleet Street. A few London entertainments of less importance are upon record. When Elizabeth first came to the Tower on 28 November 1558, there were 'in serten plasses chylderyn with speches, and odur places, syngyng and playing with regalles'.[1] When James first came to London on 7 May 1603, Dekker had prepared a show of the Genius Loci and Saints George and Andrew for performance at the Bars beyond Bishopsgate, which he afterwards printed; but he was disappointed, for James entered by another route, direct from Stamford Hill to the Charterhouse.[2] On 31 July 1606 he brought the King of Denmark to see the City, and there was an arch with Neptune, Mulciber, Concord, and the Genius of London, and a Summer Bower with a shepherd and shepherdess on the Fleet Street conduit.[3] On 16 July 1607 he dined with Henry at the hall of the Merchant Taylors, who spent £1,000 on the festivity. Ben Jonson wrote verses to be spoken by John Rice, then a boy actor at the Globe, as an angel of gladness, with a taper of frankincense in his hand, and the hall was filled with music. There were lutenists in the windows, wind-instruments on the screen, and three singers in a ship hanging aloft. The court musicians, Thomas Lupo and Mr. Lanier, and Nathaniel Giles and the Chapel were amongst those who made melody.[4] London was to the fore again in welcome to Prince Henry on his creation as Prince of Wales, sending the barges of the Lord Mayor and the companies to meet him, as he came up by river from Richmond on 31 May 1610, with Corinea on a whale to offer salutation on behalf of Cornwall at Chelsea, and Amphion on a dolphin to do the same for Wales at Whitehall. The speeches were written by Anthony Munday and delivered by Richard Burbage and John Rice.[5] A month earlier, on 23 April, another show in Henry's honour had been held at Chester. It was devised

[1] Machyn, 180.

[2] See ch. xxiv, s.v. Dekker, *Coronation Entertainment*. On 15 April 1605 the Spanish ambassador provoked a riot by 'joys and shews' to celebrate the birth of a Spanish prince (Lodge, iii. 147; Stowe, *Annales*, 862).

[3] *V. P.* x. 384; Nichols, iv. 1074.

[4] Clode, *Early History of the Merchant Taylors*, i. 276, gives many details from records of the company, including the item, 'To Mr. Hemmyngs for his direccion of his boy that made the speech to his Majesty 40*s*., and 5*s*. given to John Rise the speaker'.

[5] Cf. ch. xxiii. The entry of payments to Burbage and Rice, trumpeted as a discovery by C. W. Wallace in *The Times* for 28 March 1913, was in fact published by Halliwell-Phillipps in the *Athenaeum* for 19 May 1888; it is also in Stopes, *Burbage*, 108.

by Robert Amerie, an ex-sheriff of the town, and consisted of a horse-race on the Roodeye, after a procession in which the bearers of the bells that served as prizes were accompanied by St. George and his dragon pursuing a Green man or 'wodwose', while speeches were uttered by Fame, Mercury, Chester, Britain, Cambria, Rumour and Peace, and Joy composed a *débat* between Love and Envy.[1]

Even in the absence of the sovereign, London had pageantry for its own delight; folk-pageantry in the May-games, morrises and lords of misrule, which sometimes made their way to Court;[2] municipalized folk-pageantry in the Midsummer and St. Peter's Eve 'watches', which barely survived into Elizabeth's reign;[3] municipal pageantry fully established in the ceremony which has come down to our own day of the Lord Mayor's show. The Mayor was installed on St. Simon and St. Jude's Day, 28 October, and on 29 October he went by water to Westminster Hall to be admitted before the barons of the Exchequer in the Exchequer chamber. On his return he was met by his guildsmen and other citizens at the waterside, and escorted to dinner in the Guildhall, and after dinner to service in St. Paul's and back to his own house. There had been pageants on this occasion in the fifteenth century, but these were suppressed in 1481, and during the earlier part of the sixteenth century the spectacular element was limited to a 'foyst or wafter' upon the river, such as that with a device of a crowned falcon on a mount environed with white and red roses, which the City provided by royal command for the coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533.[4] But shortly after, and perhaps as a result of, the discontinuance of the 'watches' in 1538, the installation pageant makes its appearance again. It can be traced in 1540, and then, with the accompaniment of speeches, fireworks, devils, and 'wodwoses', in the pages of Machyn's diary during most years from

[1] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[2] Machyn, 191, 196, 201, 261, 273; cf. App. A (1559–1561).

[3] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 165, 382. Machyn, 287, records a watch with a 'castylle' at the Tower on 28 June 1562. There was another on 28 June 1564, which Elizabeth saw privately from Baynard's Castle (*Sp. P.* i. 366; cf. App. A). Puttenham, 165, speaks of 'these midsommer pageants in London, where to make the people wonder are set forth great and vglie Gyants marching as if they were aliue, and armed at all points, but within they are stuffed full of browne paper and tow, which the shrewd boys vnderpeering, do guilefully discouer and turne to a great derision'.

[4] Sharpe, *Letter Book*, L. 187, prints an order of 23 Oct. 1481 forbidding from thenceforth any 'disguysyng nor pageoun', when the Mayor went from his house to the water or the water to his house, 'as it hath been used nowe of late afore this time'. Halle, ii. 232, describes the reception of Anne Boleyn.

1553 to 1562.[1] Many details are preserved of the Merchant Taylors' pageant of 1561 for Sir William Harper, and of the Ironmongers' pageant of 1566 for Sir James Draper, in the device of which James Peele, clerk of Christ's Hospital, and father of George Peele, had a hand. On both occasions the speeches and songs were entrusted to boys from Westminster, under the 'M^r of the quirysters', John Taylor.[2] Some speeches are preserved from the Merchant Taylors' pageant of St. John Baptist for Sir Thomas Roe in 1568, while James Peele was again engaged by the Ironmongers to prepare a device, which, however, came to nothing, for Sir Alexander Avenon in 1569.[3] It must be doubtful whether there was a pageant in every year, but when William Smythe described the installation ceremonies in 1575, he included as regular features the 'devells and wyldmen' which met the returning mayor at Paul's Wharf, and 'the pageant of Tryumphe rychly decked, whervppon by certayne fygures and wrytinges (partly towchinge the name of the sayd mayor) some matter towchinge justice and the office of a magestrate is representedꞌ.[4] Von Wedel saw the Drapers' pageant for Sir Thomas Pullison in 1584.[5] Custom seems to have assigned the provision of the pageant to the 'bachelors' of the Lord

[1] Machyn, 47, 72, 96, 117, 155, 270, 294. In 1553 were a 'duyllyll' and 'ii grett wodyn, with ii grett clubes all in grene, and with skwybes bornyng'. For 1540, cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 166. A fragment of a Salters' pageant, printed by E. D. Adams in *M. L. N.* xxxii. 285, from *T. C. C. MS.* B. 15, 39, may belong to 1530 or 1542, when they had Mayors.

[2] Clode, ii. 262; Nicholl, *Ironmongers*, 84; cf. ch. xii (Westminster). The subject in 1566 is not recorded. Richard Baker, painter-stainer, had £18 for the pageant and everything except the children and their apparel; John Tailor 40*s.* to find six children 'as well for the speeches as songs'; James Pele 30*s.* 'for his devise and paynes in the paggent'; and Thomas Giles of Lombard Street (cf. chh. iii, v) £5 10*s.* for apparel. The company paid 5*s.* 'to the prynter for printing of poses speches and songs, that were spoken and songe by the children in the pagent'.

[3] Clode, *Memorials*, 115; Nicholl, *Ironmongers*, 97, 'Paid unto James Pele and Peter Baker, for the devise of a pageant, which tok none effecte, xxvj^s. viij^d.'

[4] W. Smythe, *A breffe description of London* (1575); cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 165. Dramatic allusions are *2 Promos and Cassandra*, i. 6, '[*Enter*] Two men, apparrelled lyke greene men at the Mayor feast, with clubbes of fyreworke'; *Cobbler's Prophecy*, 460, 'comes there a Pageant by, Ile stand out of the green mens way for burning my vestment'; *Dutch Courtesan*, iii. 1, 117, 'all will scarce make me so high as one of the giants' stilts that stalks before my Lord Mayor's pageant'; *Northward Hoe*, ii. 1, p. 195, 'Simon and Jude's gentlemen ushers'.

[5] *2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 252, 'a representation in the shape of a house with a pointed roof painted in blue and golden colours and ornamented with garlands, on which sat some young girls in fine apparel, one holding a book, another a pair of scales, the third a sceptre. What the others had I forget.' He gives full details of all the installation ceremonies.

Mayor's company, that is to say, those freemen who were not yet advanced to be members of the 'livery' or governing body. The Ironmongers paid for the printing of their pageant in 1566, but the first printed description now extant is that of the Skinners' pageant for Woolstan Dixie in 1585, which was written by George Peele. Peele seems to have inherited his father's connexion, for he had, according to the *Merry Jests*, 'all the oversight of the pageants', and certainly he devised the Drapers' pageant for Martin Calthorpe in 1588, which is now lost, and the *Descensus Astraeae* of the Salters for William Webbe in 1591. The Fishmongers' pageant for John Allot in 1590 was, however, by one T. Nelson, a stationer. The absence of Elizabethan prints later than these does not necessarily mean that pageants fell out of use. There was one in 1600;[1] the Merchant Taylors had one for Sir Robert Lee in 1602; there would have been one in 1603 but for the plague; and there was probably one in 1604.[2] On the other hand, it can hardly be inferred from the chaff of Munday as a 'peeking pageanter' in *Histriomastix* and as 'pageant-poet to the city of Milan' in *The Case is Altered* that he stepped regularly into Peele's shoes about 1591. Jonson's reference, at least, is subsequent to Munday's first 'book' of a pageant, which was, so far as we know, the Merchant Taylors' *Triumphs of Reunited Britannia* for Sir Leonard Holliday in 1605. I do not know on what evidence *Campbell, or the Ironmongers' Fair Field*, for Thomas Campbell in 1609, the only known copy of which has lost its title-page, is sometimes ascribed to him. But he was responsible for the Goldsmiths' *Chryso-Thriambos* for Sir James Pemberton in 1611, the Drapers' *Himatia Poleos* for Sir Thomas Hayes in 1614 and their *Metropolis Coronata* for Sir John Jolles in 1615, and the Fishmongers' *Chrysanaleia* for John Leman in 1616. His chief competitors in civic favour were Dekker and Middleton, the former of whom prepared the Merchant Taylors' *Troja Nova Triumphans* for Sir John Swinnerton in 1612, and the latter the *Triumphs of Truth* for Sir Thomas Middleton in 1613, to the 'book' of which he annexed an account of a quite exceptional entertainment on occasion of the opening of Hugh Middleton's New River on 29 September 1613.

[1] Chamberlain, 93.

[2] Clode, *Early History*, i. 264, 390, cites payments for a ship, a pageant, a lion, and a camel, and to Mr. Haines, schoolmaster of the Merchant Taylors school, for a wagon and the apparel of ten scholars, who represented Apollo and the Muses before the Mayor in Cheapside. Young, *Barber-Surgeons*, 111, prints the Lord Mayor's letter of 22 Oct. 1603 directing that there should be no show that year. Felix Kingston entered 'a thing touching the pagent' in S. R. on 29 Oct. 1604 (Arber, iii. 273).

Middleton's title-page refers scornfully to the 'common writer' of mayoral pageants, which may perhaps indicate Munday. A full analysis of all this municipal imagery would be extremely tedious. The original single pageant with its devils and 'wodwoses' underwent much elaboration in the seventeenth century. 'By this light', says a character in *Greenes Tu Quoque* (1611–12), 'I do not think but to be Lord Mayor of London before I die, and have three pageants carried before me, besides a ship and an unicorn.' Dekker's *Troja Nova Triumphans* has three movable 'land-triumphs', a chariot of Neptune, a chariot of Virtue, and a House of Fame, which met the Mayor successively at Paul's Chain, Paul's Churchyard, and the Cross in Cheapside, while the little conduit was transformed into a Castle of Envy, and met an assault with fireworks. Sometimes the old 'foist' was revived, and part of the spectacle took place on the water. Or one of the land pageants was designed in the form of a ship. There were personages mounted on strange beasts. Speeches and dialogues afforded opportunities for laudation of the Lord Mayor and his brethren. There was generally some theme bearing upon the history of the company or the industry to which it was related. The Fishmongers made play, both in 1590 and 1616, with Sir William Walworth; the Drapers, both in 1614 and 1615, with Sir Henry Fitz Alwine, and with the Ram with the Golden Fleece. The Merchant Taylors, on whose roll Prince Henry had been inscribed at the dinner of 1607, proudly displayed an impersonation of him in 1611. Often the *mimesis* was renewed on the way to St. Paul's in the afternoon, or at the Lord Mayor's house in the evening. The Ironmongers have preserved an interesting series of coloured designs for *Chrysanaleia*, the notes on which indicate that the pageants were preserved as permanent decorations for the company's hall. The ship, which held musicians at the Merchant Taylors' dinner of 1607, was probably a relic of their pageant of 1602.

The growing maritime power of England during the sixteenth century and the significance of the river as a highway between London and the palaces up and down stream led naturally to a development of pageantry by water. There was a water triumph, with an assault of a castle, on Midsummer Day, 1561, and another, arranged by Captain Stukeley, when Elizabeth went down to Greenwich in June 1563.[1] Christian of Denmark gave James a show of the 'Burning of the Seven Deadly Sins' in 'wildfire' near his flag-ship at Gravesend on 11 August 1606.[2] The creation of Henry was

[1] Machyn, 261, 309.

[2] Stowe, *Annales* (1615), 887.

celebrated by a mock sea-fight between merchantmen and Turkish pirates on 6 June 1610, and the effect of this spectacle was also enhanced by a display of fireworks. On the previous 31 May Henry had been given the welcome of the City, as he came up the river, with a device by Anthony Munday, in which Burbage and Rice of the King's men rode upon two great fishes to deliver the speeches. Burbage, as Amphion, represented Wales, and Rice, as Corinea, Cornwall.[1] Similarly the festivities at the Princess Elizabeth's wedding in 1613 included a fight between Venetian and Turkish galleys on 11 February and a firework representation of St. George delivering the Amazonian Queen Lucida from Mango the Necromancer.[2] The City had to find a pension for a man who was maimed in this triumph.[3] Bristol, the second seaport of the realm, also favoured water shows, welcoming Elizabeth in 1574 with an assault on the forts of Peace and Feeble Policy, and Anne in 1613 with a version of the more modern theme of merchantman and pirate.[4] We do not know the nature of the *Devises of Warre* prepared by Thomas Churchyard for one of Sir Thomas Gresham's entertainments of Elizabeth at Osterley; but an example of the conversion of military training into *mimesis* is afforded by the archery show of Prince Arthur with his Knights of the Round Table, which was displayed by Hugh Offley before the Queen between Merchant Taylors and Mile End in 1587.[5]

More than two centuries before this, when Edward III associated this same Round Table with the foundation of his chivalric order of the Garter, pageantry had already begun to cast its mantle over the mediaeval exercises of knightly feats of arms. As the actual practice of warfare dissociated itself more and more from the domination of the mail-clad horseman, the spectacular tendency had naturally grown. Not that, even at Whitehall, the tournament had ever become a mere pageant and nothing more. It had still its value, both as part of the courtly training of a gentleman and as a test of physical endurance; and it was chiefly about the

[1] Cf. ch. xxiii.

[2] John Taylor, *Heaven's Blessing and Earth's Joy* (Nichols, ii. 527). The use of fireworks at Kenilworth in 1575 and Elvetham in 1591, with a miniature sea-fight at the latter, has already been noted. An undated device for three days' fireworks by an Italian before the Queen, 'in the meadow', 'in the courtyard of the Palace', 'in the river' (*Pepys MSS.* 178) may belong to 1575, or possibly to the Warwick visit of 1572, at which a firework assault upon a fort in the meadow below the castle is recorded by La Mothe, v. 96.

[3] *M. S. C.* i. 89.

[4] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[5] Nichols, *Eliz.* ii. 529, from a MS. in private hands.

preliminaries, the challenge and the entrance of the knights into the lists, that the decorative fancy of the Renaissance gave itself free play. The double appeal of vigorous exercise and sumptuous spectacle was irresistible to the youthful temperament of Henry VIII, and the pages of Halle gleam with his tiltings as Cœur Loyal in 1511, of which a fine heraldic record is preserved, and with the international splendours of the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520.[1] It was largely to a desire to maintain the tradition of the spear that the existence of the Pensioners as an element in the royal household must be ascribed. Elizabeth had much of her father's blood in her, and to the end took delight in the strength of a man and a horse, so that it was still possible for an aspiring youth, such as Sir Henry Lee or Sir Robert Carey, to win his way to Court favour by the accuracy of his seat or the appropriateness of his trappings, no less than by his proficiency in the gentler antics of the mask. The rules for courtly combat had been laid down by John Tiptoft, Earl of Warwick and Constable of England in 1466, and revised for Elizabeth in 1562.[2] The generic term 'jousts of peace' covered three distinct varieties of exercise. The most important was the tilt, in which horsemen met in the shock of blunted spears across the 'tilt' or *toile*, a barrier covered with cloths, which ran longitudinally down the centre of the 'lists' or space staked out for the encounter. A record was kept of the courses run, in which marks were credited to the competitors for spears fairly broken or for 'attaints' on the head or body, and corresponding deductions made for spears ill broken. The tourney was also on horseback, with swords instead of spears; while in the foot-tourney or 'barriers' the assailants were dismounted and fought alternately with push of pike and stroke of sword across a wooden obstacle.[3]

[1] Halle, i. 22, 189; Cripps-Day, 118 (misdated 1510). The illuminated roll of 1511 is engraved in *Vetusta Monumenta*, i, pll. xxi–xxvi. Some interesting documents on early Tudor tilting are given in Cripps-Day, xliii, from *Harl. MS.* 69 (*The Book of Certaine Triumphes*).

[2] The rules are extant in *Heralds' College MSS.* I. 26, M. 6; *Harl. MSS.* 69, 1354, 1776, 2358, 2413, 6064; *Bodl. Ashm. MS.* 763; versions are printed in *Vetusta Monumenta*, i; Grose and Astle, *Antiquarian Repertory*, i. 144; Meyrick, *Antient Armor*, ii. 179; Harington, i. 1; Cripps-Day, xxvii. Viscount Dillon prints (*Arch.* lvii. 29) an illuminated fifteenth-century collection of ordinances of chivalry which belonged to Prince Henry.

[3] Dillon, *An Elizabethan Armourer's Album* (*Arch. Journal*, lii. 113), *Tilting in Tudor Times* (*A. J.* lv. 296), *Barriers and Foot-Combats* (*A. J.* lxi. 276), *Armour and Arms in Shakespeare* (*A. J.* lxv. 270); C. ffoulkes, *Jousting Cheques of the Sixteenth Century* (*Archaeologia*, lxiii. 31). W. Segar, *Honor, Military and Ciuill* (1602), iii. 54, records a number of Elizabethan jousts, or, as he calls them, 'triumphs'. Dillon (*A. J.* lv. 303) reproduces drawings of a tilt, tourney, and barriers by William Smith (*c.* 1597).

The tilt and tourney took place by daylight. Henry VIII constructed a tiltyard in Whitehall, which was improved and closed in by Elizabeth in 1561.[1] It ran between the highway and St. James's Park, from the stables on the site of the present Admiralty to the tennis court and cockpit on the site of the present Treasury buildings, and at the south end was a gallery for spectators, communicating by another across the highway with the privy apartments. The sentries in the courtyard of the Horse Guards have been officially known to recent times as the Tiltyard guards. There were permanent tiltyards also at Greenwich and at Hampton Court; at the latter spectators were accommodated in five small towers, of which one still survives.[2] The less serious exercise of the barriers was sometimes conducted by torchlight, and even within doors, on the floor of a banqueting house.[3] Thus it could be introduced, in a purely mimetic form, as an episode in a mask, or even a play.[4] Tilts took place in almost every year of Elizabeth's reign.[5] The custom was for a few picked champions to issue a challenge for a given day, on which they would be prepared to meet the onset of all who chose to offer themselves as 'answerers' or defendants. Sussex, Leicester, Hunsdon, and of the next generation Oxford and Arundel, are prominent amongst the challengers. I do not find that any particular season was at first especially appropriated to tilts. There was often one early in the new year, but just as often one in the spring or summer. But at some date, possibly as early as 1570, and almost certainly as early as 1581, Sir Henry Lee was forward in establishing an annual tilt on Queen's Day, the anniversary of the accession on 17 November. He may have enrolled some kind of guild of tilters; certainly he undertook to appear personally as challenger year by year, and for this purpose received or assumed the designation of Knight of the Crown. In his devices he appears under the personal name of Loricus.[6]

[1] W. L. Spiers in *L. T. R.* vii. 62; Machyn, 269.

[2] E. Law, *Hampton Court*, i. 135, 206.

[3] Segar (Nichols, ii. 335) describes a tourney, presumably a foot-tourney, at Whitehall by night before the French ambassador, François de Montmorency, in June 1572, with the yeomen of the guard holding 'an infinite number of torches on the terrace and in the preaching place'.

[4] The play of *Paris and Vienna* on 19 Feb. 1572 included a triumph with hobby-horses 'where Paris wan the christall sheelde for Vienna at the turneye and barryers' (Feuillerat, 141). A barriers was also fought by Amazons and Knights in a mask of 11 Jan. 1579 (Feuillerat, 287).

[5] Cf. App. A.

[6] Cf. ch. xxiv. The date at which the annual tilt began is not clear. It cannot be earlier than the institution of Queen's Day itself (1570? cf. p. 18), but as that is said to have originated at Oxford, hard by Woodstock, the

Only occasional examples of the pageantry used at tilts are upon record. An account of the proceedings on the occasion of the wedding of Ambrose Earl of Warwick and Anne Russell, daughter of the Earl of Bedford, on 11 November 1565 will show how it was introduced. The challenge took place in August, at the churching of the Princess Cecilia of Baden. York Herald introduced Richard Edwardes of the Chapel, who assumed the character of a post sent from four strange knights, and announced their challenge to be defended before the Queen and Cecilia in November. On 11 November the Queen was in the gallery at the end of the tiltyard. Edwardes entered with a trumpeter, and delivered another speech. Then the challengers rode in from the mews, each accompanied by a patron and by an Amazon with his spare horse. They circled round the tilt and took up their position at the Queen's end, to await the defendants, hanging their shields on posts beneath her window. Then the actual tilting began. The programme, although departed from, was one which seems to have been conventional, of one day for tilt, one for tourney, and one for barriers.[1] The women leading the horses by their bridles perhaps appear more frequently in earlier *hastiludia* than in those of the sixteenth century.[2] They represent, I think, the ' damsels ' of the ladies in whose names the knights fought, and whose colours they were accustomed to wear. Elizabeth's personal colours for this purpose were black and white.[3] It was a function of the ladies to award to the most successful of the defendants a jewel provided by the challengers. The principal opportunities for mimetic speechifying were afforded by the challenge, which was sometimes delivered in person, sometimes, as in the 1565 example, by deputy, and was probably also

two may have come into existence together. Segar, who compares Lee's enterprise to ' the Knighthood della Banda in Spaine ', assigns it to the beginning of the reign. On the other hand, I have not found any actual evidence for a tilt on 17 Nov. before 1581, although there is plenty afterwards. The references to the matter on Lee's tombstone and in the fragments of the *Ferrers MS.* do not help, unless fragment (iv) belongs to the Woodstock entertainment of 1575, in which case the vow ' not far from hence ' must be before that date. Is it possible that the tilting at first took place at Oxford or Woodstock itself and was transferred to Whitehall about 1581 ? In 1593, perhaps owing to the plague, it was held at Windsor.

[1] Leland, *Collectanea*, ii. 666.

[2] Thus at a joust of 1494 (Kingsford, *Chronicle*, 201), ' iiij fayre ladyes . . . ladde their Bridellis with iiij silkyn laces of white and blewe '. After a joust in May 1571, ladies led the armed victors to receive their prizes in the presence chamber (Nichols, ii. 334, from Segar).

[3] Cf. p. 52. Hunsdon and Dudley, as challengers, wore black and white in 1559 ; in 1560 the heralds were in black and white (Machyn, 216, 231).

hung up on the court gates,[1] and by the shields which bore *imprese* or mottoed emblems, and called for interpretation by the squires or pages who bore them.[1] Often, moreover, the tilters themselves entered in elaborately mimetic caparisons, incongruous enough to a modern taste with the vigorous manly exercise to which they were a preliminary, but no doubt attractive to that of the Renaissance, which for all its literary talk about 'decorum' cared at heart but little for congruity. The speechifying might be resumed when the tilting was over, or at the banquet which closed the day's festivity.[2] I gather together the few details of this tilt pageantry which have escaped a perhaps merited oblivion. There were speeches, and a chariot with a damsel and an

[1] A galley on the waterside at Whitehall is described as hung with these shields by Von Wedel (*2 R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* ix. 236) in 1584 and by Hentzner in 1598, 'emblemata varia papyracea, clypei formam habentia, quibus, adiectis symbolis, nobiles in exercitiis equestribus & gladiatoriis uti sunt soliti, hic memoriae caussa suspensa', and Manningham, 3, describes 'certayne devises and empresaes taken by the scucheons in the Gallery at Whitehall' in 1602. The Shield Gallery was still extant in the time of Pepys. Aubrey, *Wilts.* 88, says that a similar collection of shields at Wilton were 'of pastboard painted with their devices and emblems, which was very pretty and ingenious'. Of course, these were not used in the actual encounter. On *imprese*, cf. F. Brie, *Shakespeare und die Impresa-Kunst seiner Zeit* (1914, *Sh.-Jahrbuch*, l. 9); G. F. Barwick, *Impresas* (*2 Library*, vii. 140); Lee, *Shakespeare*, 455. A contemporary treatise is Paolo Giovio, *Dialogo dell' Imprese Militari et Amorose* (1555). Good examples are afforded by *Pericles*, II. ii.

[2] Von Wedel (loc. cit. 258) describes the accession tilt of 1584: 'About twelve o'clock the queen with her ladies placed themselves at the windows in a long room of Whitehall palace, near Westminster, opposite the barrier where the tournament was to be held. From this room a broad staircase led downwards, and round the barrier stands were arranged by boards above the ground, so that everybody by paying 12*d.* could get a stand and see the play. . . . During the whole time of the tournament all who wished to fight entered the lists by pairs, the trumpets being blown at the time and other musical instruments. The combatants had their servants clad in different colours; they, however, did not enter the barrier, but arranged themselves on both sides. Some of the servants were disguised like savages, or like Irishmen, with the hair hanging down to the girdle like women, others had horse manes on their heads, some came driving in a carriage, the horses being equipped like elephants, some carriages were drawn by men, others appeared to move by themselves; altogether the carriages were of very odd appearance. Some gentlemen had their horses with them and mounted in full armour directly from the carriage. . . . When a gentleman with his servant approached the barrier, on horseback or in a carriage, he stopped at the foot of the staircase leading to the queen's room, while one of his servants in pompous attire of a special pattern mounted the steps and addressed the queen in well-composed verses or with a ludicrous speech, making her and her ladies laugh. When the speech was ended he in the name of his lord offered to the queen a costly present, which was accepted and permission given to take part in the tournament.'

old knight made their appearance at the torchlight tourney for the Duc de Montmorency in 1572.[1] In 1579 Oxford and his fellow challengers prepared a device, 'prettier than it happened to be performed', the nature of which is not specified.[2] In 1581 Arundel issued a challenge on 6 January, under the name of Callophisus, for a tilt which took place on 22 January, and there were 'devices in the mean season', to which some documents in a romantic vein amongst the *Lansdowne MSS.* probably belong.[3] The coming of the French commissioners in 1581 was the occasion of spectacular entertainments on an elaborate scale. There appear to have been two distinct jousts. One, at Hampton Court, probably on 6 and 7 May, is described in a French report. An antique tower with a triangular lantern at the top was rolled forward. Out of this issued a snake, which endeavoured to climb fruit-laden trees. Then followed six eagles, concealing musicians, and two Irish youths dressed in floating robes of silver tiffany, with long gilded hair and mounted on gilded horses. Finally came a triumphal car moving backwards, on which were the Fates, holding prisoner in a golden chain a knight in brown velvet and golden armour. The next day furnished new devices, including little coaches drawn by asses sewn up in white satin.[4] The second, at Whitehall on 15 and 16 May, is the famous triumph in which Sir Philip Sidney tilted before 'that sweet enemy, France'. The royal gallery was transformed into a Fortress of Perfect Beauty, and the four challengers, Arundel, Windsor, Sidney, and Fulke Greville, besieged it before each day's tilting as the Four Foster Children of Desire, finally making their submission, through a boy clad in ash-colour and bearing an olive-branch, to the unconquerable occupant. Each of the twenty-one defendants also had his 'invention' and speech, including Sir Thomas Perrot and Anthony Cooke, 'both in like armour, beset with apples and fruit, the one signifying Adam, the other Eve, who had hair hung all down her helmet'. In the midst of the first day's tilting came in Sir Henry Lee as an unknown

[1] Nichols, ii. 335, from Segar.

[2] Lodge, ii. 146.

[3] Nichols, ii. 334, from Segar; *M. S. C.* i. 181, from *Lansd. MS.* 99, f. 259.

[4] Von Raumer, ii. 431, from a letter of M. Nellot of the French Embassy in *Dupuy MS.* xxxiii. I do not feel sure that the writer is really describing a distinct joust from that of Whitehall, although he certainly locates it at Hampton Court, and the French commissioners certainly visited Hampton Court, with Leicester and Pembroke, on 6 May (Walsingham's *Journal*). He gives Arundel and Windsor as challengers, and the two 'Irish youths' might be Perrot and Cooke. Tilney only charged in the Revels Account (Feuillerat, 341) for one challenge and two days' triumph.

knight, broke his spears, and departed in true romantic fashion without revealing his identity.[1] In 1587, when the tilting on Queen's Day was 'not so full of devises and so riche as I have seene', is a mention of books given 'for a token' to the spectators[2]; and to 1590 belongs such a book in the extant *Polyhymnia* of George Peele.[3] This was a notable occasion, for upon it Sir Henry Lee, now past his youth, resigned the post of challenger to the Earl of Cumberland. Peele describes the *imprese* of the tilters. But the principal device took place after the courses had been run. A Temple of Vesta rose out of the earth, and at its door Lee's emblem of the crowned pillar. An appropriate song was sung, the well-known

'My golden locks time hath to silver turned,'

and the Vestal Virgins presented the Queen with a veil and cloak and safeguard; after which Lee doffed his armour, put it on Cumberland as his successor, and himself assumed, as a sign of his retirement, a side coat of black velvet and a buttoned cap of the country fashion. He continued, however, by the royal direction, to attend the annual Queen's day, as a kind of Master of the Ceremonies. Cumberland, who took the name of the Knight of Pendragon Castle, probably remained knight of the crown until the end of the reign, but may have been rather overshadowed by the reputation, both as a courtier and a tilter, of the popular and magnificent Earl of Essex.[4] Robert Carey also claims to have played a considerable figure in the jousts, and tells us how in 1593 he appeared and made the Queen a present as 'the forsaken knight that had vowed solitarinesse' at a cost of £400.[5] To 1595 belongs the device of Eros and Philautia, in which Essex is believed to have had the assistance of no less a hand than that of Francis Bacon.[6] In 1598 it is noted that

[1] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[2] Gawdy, 25, sent his father 'ij small bookes for a token, the one of them was gyven me that day that they rann at tilt, divers of them being gyven to most of the lordes, and gentlemen about the court, and one especially to the Quene'. On 18 Nov. 1595, John Danter entered in *S. R.* (Arber, iii. 53) 'a new ballad of the honorable order of the Runnynge at Tilt at Whitehall the 17 of November in the 38 year of her Maiesties reign', but it does not appear to be extant.

[3] Cf. ch. xxiii (s.v. Lee).

[4] Gawdy, 67 (n.d. but ascribed by ed. to 1592), 'Uppon the coronation day at nyght ther cam two knightes armed vpp into the pryvy chamber videlicet my L. of Essex and my L. of Cumberland and ther made a challenge that vppon the xxvjth of ffebruary next that they will runn with all commers to mayntayn that ther M. is most worthiest and most fayrest Amadis de Gaule'.

[5] R. Carey, *Memoirs*, 32.

[6] Cf. ch. xxiii (s.v. Bacon).

Queen's day passed 'without any extraordinarie matter more than running and ringing'. In 1600 Essex, then under a cloud, was, contrary to expectation, 'no actor in our triumphs', but Cumberland delivered a speech in the capacity of a Melancholy Knight. In 1602 one Garret came disguised, like Carey in 1593, and gave the Queen his scutcheon and *impresa*.[1] In 1601 there seems to have been a barriers, for which Sir John Davies was invited by Sir Robert Cecil through Cumberland to write an introductory speech.[2]

James transferred the annual tilting to his own accession day, and it continued to be regularly observed on 24 March. Shows 'costly and somewhat extraordinary' are recorded on this day in 1605.[3] In 1607 the French ambassador comments that there were 'plus de beaux habits que de bons gendarmes'.[4] In 1609 Sir Richard Preston made a sensation 'in a pageant which was an elephant with a castle on his back'.[5] James himself was no tilter; his horsemanship was considerable, but he employed it in the chase rather than in the onset. It is noteworthy that running at the ring, which was quite a subsidiary sport at the court of Elizabeth, tends under her successor to replace the more hazardous jousts. And even at the ring the marked inferiority of James to his brother-in-law Christian of Denmark during the latter's visit in 1606 became the subject of popular comment, and did not tend to improve the relations between the sovereigns. The 'incomparable pair of brethren', William Earl of Pembroke, and Philip Earl of Montgomery, shone in the tilt-yard[6]; and it was a fall from his horse at a joust that first attracted the King's attention to Robert Carr, afterwards Earl of Somerset.[7] But the most prominent man-at-arms, during the earlier years of the reign, was James's cousin, Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Lennox. He led on one side for Truth, against the Earl of Sussex for Opinion on the other, at a barriers given to celebrate the wedding of the Earl of Essex on 6 January 1606, and the invaluable Jonson wrote a dialogue of Truth and Opinion as a setting for the combat.[8] Later in the same

[1] Chamberlain, 29, 163; Winwood, i. 271, 274.
[2] *Hatfield MSS.* xi. 462, 540, 544.
[3] Winwood, ii. 54.
[4] Boderie, ii. 144.
[5] Birch, i. 92.
[6] Rowland Whyte (Lodge, iii. 162) writing of a 'great tilt' in which Montgomery was to take part on 20 May 1605, adds the lines—

> The Herberts every cockpit day,
> Do carry away
> The gold and glory of the day.

The Westminster tilt-yard was, of course, close to the Cockpit.
[7] A. Wilson (*Compleat Hist.* ii. 686).
[8] Cf. ch. xxiii (s.v. Jonson, *Hymenaei*).

year Lennox was at the head of a plan to honour the visit of King Christian by a challenge to be issued by certain knights of the Fortunate Island, who fabled themselves to be inspired by the adventure of the Lucent Pillar, foretold by Merlin, and declared their intention to joust on behalf of certain amorous propositions in the valley of Mirefleur. The original idea was to publish the challenge in the courts of Europe, but this feature was dropped, somewhat to the relief of the French ambassador, who had received instructions from Paris to discourage it, as a coming royal baptism there would make sufficient demands on shrunken French pockets, and feats of arms had, moreover, fallen into disuse in France since the days of Henri II. A challenge was in fact proclaimed, for England only, in the royal presence and the public places of Greenwich, on 1 June. Then the death of the child-princess Mary supervened, and although there was a tilt, in which Christian took part, on 5 August, it does not appear that the romantic setting was used.[1] Merlin, however, was utilized by Jonson, some years later, when Prince Henry, to whom knightly exercises were as congenial as they were repugnant to his father, made his first public appearance in the barriers of 6 January 1610.[2] He issued his challenge under the name of Meliadus, Lord of the Isles, and Jonson's device, in which Merlin and the Lady of the Lake hail him as the awakener of Chivalry from her cave, reflects something of the enthusiasm with which Englishmen were beginning to look forward to the future of the high-spirited prince.[3] There was a joust on 6 June 1610, after Henry's creation as Prince of Wales, although Henry did not himself take part in it.[4] He was tilting daily in January 1612, and a challenge by Lennox, Southampton, Pembroke, and Montgomery is dated

[1] W. Drummond of Hawthornden, *Works* (1711), 231; Boderie, i. 58, 105, 136, 173, 185, 260. The challenge of the Knights Errants, who were the Earls of Lennox, Arundel, Pembroke, and Montgomery, is sent by Drummond to a correspondent, with a reply in the same vein, but there is nothing to suggest that he was the author. Ford's (q.v.) *Honour Triumphant* (1606) is addressed to the four Earls.

[2] There are several extant portraits of Henry in tilting armour; one is engraved in Drayton's *Polyolbion* (1613). Dillon (*A. J.* lii. 125; lx. 132) notes that he had five suits of tilting-armour. One, given him by Lee, cost £200. Another, given by Prince de Joinville, is in the Tower. A third, at Windsor, was made by William Pickering at Greenwich, apparently on one of the designs by Jacobe now at South Kensington. As early as 18 Aug. 1604, when he was ten years old, the Constable of Castile saw Henry at pike and horse exercise, and gave him a pony (*V. P.* x. 178).

[3] Cf. ch. xxiii (s.v. Jonson, *Prince Henry's Barriers*).

[4] Nichols, ii. 361.

in this year.[1] But the chivalric revival was fated to be dashed for ever by the untimely death of its princely patron on the following 6 November. The Accession tilt of 1613 is made memorable by the fact that the Earl of Rutland had the signal honour of being furnished with an *impresa* by the united genius of Shakespeare and Burbage, whom we must presume to have been the poet and the painter respectively.[2] At Elizabeth's wedding in 1613 there was ringing only.[3] One more device by Jonson, with Cupids and Hymen, introduced a tilt on 1 January 1614, after the wedding of the Earl of Somerset, and my chronicle must end with the Accession tilt of 1616, for which again Burbage furnished the Earl of Rutland with a shield, although the name of Shakespeare, then probably on his death-bed, does not appear.[4]

[1] Clephan, 133, 176, from *Harl. MSS.* 4888, art. 20; cf. App. A.

[2] *Rutland MSS.* iv. 494, 'Item 31 Martii to M^r. Shakspeare in gold about my Lords impreso xliiij^s. To Richard Burbadge for paynting and making y^t in gold xliiij^s'. Wotton, ii. 17, mentions the 'bare *imprese*, whereof some were so dark that their meaning is not yet understood, unless perchance that were their meaning, not to be understood'.

[3] Nichols, ii. 549.

[4] *Rutland MSS.* iv. 508, 'Paid given Richard Burbidg for my lordes shield and for the embleance, 4^l. 18^s'.

V

THE MASK

[*Bibliographical Note.* The origins of the mask are treated in my book on *The Mediaeval Stage* (1903), ch. xvii, and, with its Tudor and Stuart developments, in R. Brotanek, *Die englischen Maskenspiele* (1902), and P. Reyher, *Les Masques anglais* (1909). An earlier study of merit is A. Soergel, *Die englischen Maskenspiele* (1882). R. Bayne contributes a chapter on *Masque and Pastoral* (*C. H.* vi.), and P. Simpson one on *The Masques* (*Sh. England*, ii. 311). I have not seen W. Scherm, *Englische Hofmaskeraden*. Useful material, handled with imperfect scholarship, is in M. Sullivan, *Court Masques of James I* (1913), and there are dissertations by A. H. Thorndike, *The Influence of the Court-Masque on the Drama, 1608–15* (*M. L. A.* xv. 114), J. W. Cunliffe, *Italian Prototypes of the Masque and Dumb Show* (*M. L. A.* xxii. 140), W. Y. Durand, *A Comedy on Marriage and some Early Anti-masques* (*J. G. P.* vi. 412), and J. A. Lester, *Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama* (1909, *Haverford Essays*). Most of the scanty Elizabethan material is in A. Feuillerat, *Documents relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth* (1908, *Materialien*, xxi, cited as Feuillerat, *Eliz.*), and the relation of the Revels Office to masks is studied in his *Le Bureau des Menus-Plaisirs et la Mise en Scène à la Cour d'Elizabeth* (1910, cited as Feuillerat, *M. P.*); cf. also ch. iii. Many of the contemporary descriptions of masks are edited amongst the works of the poets, and are also to be found, with the few that are anonymous, in J. Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth* (1823), and *Progresses of James I* (1828); P. Cunningham and J. P. Collier, *Inigo Jones, a Life; and Five Court Masques* (*Sh. Soc.* 1848); and H. A. Evans, *English Masques* (1897). A valuable bibliography is W. W. Greg, *A List of Masques, Pageants, &c.* (*Bibl. Soc.* 1902). Analogous French texts are in P. Lacroix, *Ballets et Mascarades de Cour* (1868–70), and are studied in V. Fournel, *Les Contemporains de Molière* (1863), ii. 173, G. Bapst, *Essai sur l'Histoire du Théâtre* (1893), 193, and H. Prunières, *Le Ballet de Cour en France* (1914).]

The mask is not primarily a drama; it is an episode in an indoor revel of dancing. Masked and otherwise disguised persons come, by convention unexpectedly, into the hall, as a compliment to the hosts or the principal guests. Often they bring them gifts; always they dance before them, and then invite them to join the dance. They bring torch-bearers and musicians, who light and accompany the choric evolutions. Their intention lends itself to elaboration by spokesmen or presenters, and to such spectacular decoration as a pageant or scene affords; thus it readily assumes a mimetic setting. It is necessary to lay stress on the fact that the guests mingle with the maskers in the dance. This intimacy between performers and spectators differentiates the mask

from the drama to the end; its goal is the masked ball, not the opera. And as a corollary to this intimacy, the performers are of the same social standing as the audience; the mask is an amateur and not a professional performance.

I have attempted elsewhere to indicate a possible folk origin for the mask in the visits of excited worshippers, with fragments of a divine and immolated animal, from house to house of a village, in order that all may share the direct contact of the beneficent and potent thing. Those persistent vizards and torches may perhaps recall, the one the head and skin of the sacrificed victim, the other the brand snatched from the sacrificial fire, itself perhaps the survival of a sunshine charm even older than the sacrifice.[1] Obviously in the humanist and even sceptical court of Elizabeth any consciousness of the 'luck' of the mask must have been quite subliminal. It was a custom, like the rest, belonging of right to the twelve days of the Christmas rejoicing, but adaptable readily enough to a wedding or any other occasion of mundane festivity. As a medium of courtly compliment to a sovereign it is already well established in the fourteenth century. When Prince Richard, afterwards Richard II, was keeping Candlemas at Kennington in 1377, citizens of London, to the number of 130, rode to visit him with musicians and torchbearers. They wore vizards and were dressed to represent the members of an imperial and a papal court. Entering the hall, they diced with the prince and his company for jewels, using loaded dice so as to be sure of losing. After the dicing the music sounded, and 'the prince and the lordes danced on the one syde and the mummers on the other a great while and then they dronck and tooke their leaue'. The whole proceeding is called 'mumming'.[2] It is to be noted that the 'lucky' character of the gifts is emphasized by the show of dicing, and that the fraternization of maskers and spectators in the dance is clearly marked. This is important, because during the changes of the fifteenth century this particular and primitive element was apparently forgotten. It was a period of literary and spectacular elaboration. The dance in disguise attracted to itself other forms of courtly entertainment that were then in vogue; the speech and dialogue of allegorical or mythological personages, the architectural pageant, the mimic tournament, even the interlude.[3] Splendid devices were shown in Westminster Hall before the sovereigns under their cloths of estate at the wedding of

[1] *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 390.
[2] Ibid. 394; Reyher, 499; from *Harl. MS.* 247, f. 172v
[3] *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 396.

Prince Arthur and Katharine of Aragon in 1501.[1] On the first night three great pageants were successively wheeled in. The first was a castle drawn by four beasts and bearing eight disguised ladies. The second was a ship with mariners, whose 'counteynaunces speaches and demeanor' doubtless furnished an element of comedy. They brought Hope and Love, who were ambassadors from the third pageant, a Mount of Love, which bore eight knights. These descended and assaulted the castle, and finally the ladies yielded and knights and ladies danced together. On the second night the pageants represented an arbour and a lanthorn; on the third two mountains; on the fourth, at Richmond, a chapel. Very similar to these revels of Henry VII's reign are those described by the chronicler Halle during the early years of that of Henry VIII.[2] Many variations are possible. There is not always a pageant. The comic element may take the form of a 'morris'. The whole thing may form a setting or afterpiece to an interlude. Occasionally a dicing is introduced, and to this variety the term 'mumming' or 'mummery' appears by the sixteenth century to have been specialized.[3] The more generic term is 'disguising'. For all its elaboration, the early sixteenth-century disguising retained many of its original features. Vizards and torches are employed. The disguisers come in suddenly, as a surprise to the guests. But

[1] Leland, *Collectanea*, v. 359; Reyher, 500; from Ralph Starkey, *Booke of Certain Triumphes* (*Harl. MS.* 69, f. 29v); Grose and Astle, *The Antiquarian Repertory*, ii. 249.

[2] Halle, i. 15, 21, 22, 25, 40; Brewer, ii. 2, 1490 *sqq.*, from *Revels Accounts* (*Misc. Bks. Exch., T. of R.* 217).

[3] Brotanek, 118; Reyher, 14, citing, *inter alia*, *A Manifest Detection of . . . Diceplay* (*Percy Soc.* lxxxvii), 37, 'If it be winter season when masking is most in use . . . they hire . . . a suit of right masking apparel, and after, invite divers guests to a supper, all such as be then of estimation, to give them credit by their acquaintance, or such as . . . will be liberal to hazard some thing in a mumchance; by which means they assure themselves, at the least, to have supper scot free; perchance to win xx^{li} about. And howsoever the common people esteem the thing I am clear out of doubt, that the more half of your gay masks in London are grounded upon such cheating crafts, and tend only the pouling and robbing of the King's subjects'. The dice were loaded otherwise for Richard II. A 'mummery', with 'foure visards, foure gownes, a boxe and a drumme', is dramatized in *Soliman and Perseda* (Boas, *Kyd*, 189), ii. 1, 187, where for 'Charleman is come' (l. 228), *lege* 'Christemas is come'. It is in dumb show, which confirms the supposed etymological connexion with 'mum' (cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 396). 'Mumchance' is a common term for dice-play. But the French *momon*, *momerie*, and Italian *mumia* do not appear to have been specialized in the English sense. 'Some goodly mummery at supper' was planned for the meeting of Henry VIII and Charles V at Gravelines in July 1520 (*Rutland Papers*, *C. S.* 54). Jonson introduces Mumming as a dancer in his *Masque of Christmas* (1616).

unlike the visitors of Richard II in 1377, they do not, so far as the records show, call upon the guests to take a part in the dancing. This characteristic feature of the primitive ceremony seems, under these particular conditions, to have dropped out. Generally, though not always, there are two sets of disguised persons, lords and ladies, corresponding to the 'double mask' of later days, and these dance together. When they go out, the guests very likely dance amongst themselves, before the 'void', or refreshment of wine and spices, comes in. But of direct contact between disguisers and guests, except in the old-fashioned 'mummery' with its dice-play, there is nothing.

This same divorce between performers and spectators seems to rule in the *momeries* and *entremets*, which correspond to the English disguisings in fifteenth-century France and Burgundy, and in many of the *intermedii* and *trionfi* of fifteenth-century Italy.[1] But somewhere in Italy, possibly in the carnival masks of Florence, the primitive practice must have survived; and from Italy it made its way back again to France, and also to England, under the rather unjustifiable colour of a novelty.[2] It was on the Twelfth Night of 1512,

[1] For France, cf. the examples of 1377, 1389, 1393, 1457, &c., cited by Brotanek, 287, Prunières, 3; the verses of Charles d'Orléans (> 1415) for a *mommerie* of women (ed. d'Héricault, i. 148); the 'danse en barboire, en laquelle fut dancé à la mode de France, de l'Allemaigne, d'Espaigne et Lombardye, et à la fin en la manière de Poitou' at the betrothal of Claude of France and Charles of Austria in 1501 (Jean d'Auton, *Chron. de Louis XII*, ii. 99); and the revels during the Italian campaigns of Louis at Pavia and Milan in 1507 (Jean d'Auton, iv. 289, 311). At Milan lords danced 'en masque' and ladies danced 'a relays les unes apres les autres', but it is not definitely said that ladies and maskers danced together. The 'danse en barboire' possibly illustrates the enigmatical *barbaturiae* of which the nuns of St. Radegund in Poitou were guilty in the eighth century (*Mediaeval Stage*, i. 362). For Burgundy, cf. Prunières, 10, citing accounts of the crusaders' Feast of the Pheasant (1454), and the wedding of Duke Charles and Margaret of York (1468). In 1454 there were dumb shows of the Golden Fleece, followed by the entry of Grâce-Dieu and her train of Virtues, who delivered a speech and then 'commencèrent à danser en guise de mommeries'. In 1468 there were 'entremeetz mouvans' of the Labours of Hercules (Olivier de la Marche, ed. *Soc. H. F.* iii. 134, 143). These shows were given while the guests were still at table. When they were over, the tables were cleared away, and the guests danced.

[2] To the *entremetz* of France correspond the *intermedii* of Italy. These, as described by Creizenach, ii. 419; D'Ancona, ii. 168, 420; Symonds, *Shakspeare's Predecessors*, 321; *Renaissance in Italy*, v. 122; Prunières, 28; Cunliffe, *Early English Classical Tragedies*, xxxix, and in *M. L. A.* xxii. 150 and *M. P.* iv. 597, were *entr'actes* to late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century plays, but very similar shows were given independently at banquets; e. g. the mimetic *chori* with Silenus for *risus* devised by Bergonzio Botta for the wedding of Giangaleazzo Sforza and Isabella of Aragon

according to Halle, that 'the Kyng with xi other wer disguised, after the maner of Italie, called a maske, a thyng not seen afore in Englande, thei were appareled in garmentes long and brode, wrought all with gold, with visers and cappes of gold, and after the banket doen, these maskers came in, with sixe gentlemen disguised in silke bearyng staffe torches, and desired the ladies to daunce, some were content, and some that knew the fashion of it refused, because it was not a thyng commonly seen. And after thei daunced and commoned together, as the fashion of the maskes is, thei toke their leave and departed, and so did the Quene, and all the ladies.'[1] There has been much dispute as to what the precise nature of the innovation of 1512 was. I formerly thought that it lay in the introduction of some Italian detail of costume, probably the 'long gowns and hoods with hats' of which the contemporary *Revels Account* speaks.[2] But after a careful review of the earlier descriptions of disguisings, I now feel little doubt that those are right who find the point precisely in that 'commoning' between maskers and spectators which remained a characteristic feature of the mask throughout the days of its most sumptuous development, and which the good Halle could hardly be expected to recognize as merely a reversion to a fourteenth-century English usage.[3] Nor is there any reason to doubt that the impulse to the new-old mode, and perhaps also the name which, although in an English form, accompanied it, had an immediate origin in Italy.[4] Ronsard makes a similar acknowledgement for France:[5]

at Tortona in 1489 (Calchi, *Nuptiae Mediolaniorum Ducum* in Graevius, *Thesaurus*, ii. 1, 509). *Trionfi* are primarily out-of-door processions with cars.

[1] Halle, i. 40; Brewer, ii. 1497, from *Revels Accounts*.

[2] *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 401; cf. Brotanek, 67.

[3] Evans, xxi; Reyher, 491; Cunliffe in *M. L. A.* xxii. 140.

[4] Cf. Marlowe, *Edward II*, 55 'Ile haue Italian maskes by night'. 'Mask' seems to be derived from a Teutonic root related to Lat. *macula*, and means a 'net' or 'stain'. Both 'maske' and 'maskel' are M.E. forms; but I do not find the word used in connexion with disguisings, either for the performance or for the vizard, before 1512. Halle's book was unfinished at his death in 1547, and for him 'maske' and its derivative 'masker' are regular for the performance and the performer. He also uses a 'masker' (i. 215), a 'maskery' (i. 209), 'in maskeler' (i. 209), 'apparel of maskery' (i. 217), and 'maskyng apparel' (i. 171, 217; ii. 220). For the face-mask he retains 'viser'. The *Revels Accounts* for 1512–22 use 'maskeller' or 'meskeller' as noun abstract and adjective, and 'maskelyng' or 'meskellyng' as adjective or participle. 'Masking garments', and 'a maske' for the performance first appear in a Revels document of 1539. In those of Cawarden's time 'maske' and its derivatives are established. Jonson (cf. p. 176) seems responsible for stereotyping the spelling 'masque', which, however, Lyly (cf. *Works*, ii. 103) had used before him.

[5] Ronsard (ed. Marty-Leveaux), vi. 310.

> Mascarade et Cartels ont prins leur nourriture,
> L'un des Italiens, l'autre des vieux François, . . .
> . . . L'accord Italien quand il ne veut bastir
> Un Théâtre pompeux, un cousteux repentir,
> La longue Tragedie en Mascarade change.
> Il en est l'inuenteur ; nous suyuons ses leçons,
> Comme ses vestemens, ses mœurs et ses façons,
> Tant l'ardeur des François aime la chose estrange.

And in fact it is an Italian festivity of 1492 that furnishes the only clear account of a revel in which disguised persons took the ordinary guests out to dance that I have yet come across between 1377 and 1512.[1]

For some time the mask and the old-fashioned disguising are traceable side by side at the court of Henry VIII. Ultimately they amalgamated. By the end of the reign, 'mask' has become the official name, and 'disguising' is obsolete.[2] The 'commoning' between maskers and guests is firmly established. And the mask has taken to itself the elaborations of the disguisings, the introductory speeches, the pageant, the mimic fight, the double sets of dancers, the close association with the interlude.[3] Or, more strictly speaking, it can be either simple or elaborate, a mere masked

[1] This is at the end of a *farsa* by Jacopo Sannazaro given before Alfonso Duke of Calabria in 1492 (D'Ancona, ii. 98, from *Opere* of 1723). 'Subito uscirono li trombetti sonando, tutti vestiti riccamente d'una maniera, l'illustrissimo signore Principe di Capua con gli altri in mumia, delicatamente vestiti ad una maniera del Signore di Castiglia . . . con torcie in mano ballando. Da poi, ciascuno prese una Signora per la mano, e ballò la sua alta e bassa ; e con le torchie in mano se ne tornorono : e per quella sera così ebbe fine la festa.' In a revel at Ferrara in 1473 (Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Script.* xxiv. 244), Duke Hercules and his fellows danced with the ladies, and then came in 'grande multitudini di mascare', and danced ; but it is not clear that the Duke was a masker, or that the masked persons danced with the ladies. I should add that I have not been able to make any complete or first-hand investigation of foreign analogies to the mask. Doubtless the street masks of the Florentine carnival had a folk origin like that which I assign to the English mumming ; for their elaboration by Lorenzo de' Medici (1448–92) cf. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, iv. 338 ; D'Ancona, i. 253 ; Prunières, 20. M. Prunières appears to regard the 'taking out' to dance as no part of the original custom, but an adaptation due to the courts of Ferrara and Modena at the end of the fifteenth century.

[2] It is significant that John Farlyon in 1534 was appointed Yeoman of masks, revels, and disguisings ; Cawarden in 1544 Master of revels and masks (*Tudor Revels*, 7, 9 ; cf. p. 72). In Jonson's *Masque of Augurs* (1623) Notch says to the Groom of the Revels, 'Disguise was the old English word for a masque, Sir, before you were an implement belonging to the Revels'.

[3] Halle, i. 57, 117, 143, 149, 153, 171, 176, 179, 208, 215, 220, 234, 238, 247, 249, 256 ; ii. 24, 79, 87, 108, 149, 183, 220, 303, 360 ; Brewer, ii. 2, 1490 ; iii. 1548 ; iv. 418, 1390, 1415, 1603, from *Revels Accounts*.

dance, or a far-fetched and costly device, as occasion and economy may demand. As far as I can see, the whole evolution of the form, as we find it in the seventeenth century, was already complete under Henry VIII. Anne Boleyn, in 1532, led the first recorded mask in which women took lords out to dance.[1] Even the fixed scene had made its appearance, as an alternative to the movable pageant, before the end of the reign.[2]

The mask retained its vogue under Edward VI and Mary, and Elizabeth, with her special love of dancing, was not likely to neglect it.[3] The annals of her court, indeed, have left us few such detailed descriptions of masks as Halle affords for that of Henry VIII and the mask-writers themselves for that of James I. This may be an accident, or it may be that either economy or taste led Elizabeth to a preference for the mask simple over the mask spectacular, which most invites description. The story of the Elizabethan mask has to be pieced together from the account-books of the Revels Office, or, where these fail, from scattered sources. But though we would gladly have more detail, especially on the literary and dramatic side, the result of such a survey is sufficient to show that this particular type of *mimesis* contributed at least as much to the Christmas entertainment of Gloriana as to that of either her father or her successor.

The first mask of the reign was on Twelfth Night, 1559. Some of its details recall, across a space of two centuries, those of the Kennington ' mumming ' of 1377. In both cases the performers represented ecclesiastical personages, and in both there was the somewhat exceptional feature of a parade in the streets. Naturally the Elizabethan show, with its crows, asses, and wolves dressed as cardinals, bishops, and abbots, made a characteristic sixteenth-century appeal to the sympathies of a reviving Protestantism.[4] But even in 1377

[1] Halle, ii. 220.

[2] The descriptions of the devices employed in the ' great chamber of disguisings ' at Greenwich in 1527 (Halle, ii. 86, 108) suggest that they were fixed. The setting for one of the masks was certainly revealed ' by lettyng doune of a courtaine ', not by wheeling in a pageant.

[3] The available material for 1547–58 is collected, mainly from the Revels documents in the *Loseley MSS.*, by A. Feuillerat in *Materialien*, xliv.

[4] Il Schifanoya to Castellan of Mantua (*V. P.* vii. 11), ' As I suppose your Lordship will have heard of the *farsa* performed in the presence of her Majesty on the day of the Epiphany, and I not having sufficient intellect to interpret it, nor yet the mummery performed after supper on the same day, of crows in the habits of Cardinals, of asses habited as Bishops, and of wolves representing Abbots, I will consign it to silence . . . Nor will I record the levities and unusual licentiousness practised at the Court in dances and banquets, nor the masquerade of friars in the streets of London.'

the satirical element had not been lacking, for after emperor and pope came riding at the end of the procession ' 8 or 10 arayed and with black vizerdes like deuils, nothing amiable, seeming like legates '. The 1559 mask appears to have been on a much larger scale than was customary. There were at least four cardinals and six priests. There were popes, monks, summoners, and vergers. And there were friars, in black, white, yellow, russet, and green, apparently a pair of each colour. The russet friars wore velvet garments, with sleeves of yellow velvet and purple satin ' partie paned ' ; the popes and cardinals rochets of white sarcenet ; the monks kirtles and cowls of black taffeta with sleeves of purple satin. The Revels Office was careful to provide hats for the cardinals and ' croger-staves ' for the bishops. Four other masks followed during the same winter. Two formed part of the festivities accompanying the coronation, which took place on 15 January. These were a mask, probably of Conquerors in white cloth of silver, on 16 January, and a mask, probably of six Moors, on 22 January. The Moors had apparel of cloth of gold and blue velvet, with sleeves of silver sarcenet and ' bases ' of red satin. On their heads was curled hair made of black lawn and wreathed with red gold sarcenet and silver lawn. Their limbs and faces were of black velvet, and of these it is recorded that ' the lords that masked toke awey parte '. They carried darts of ' tree and paste paper gilded ', and as the Revels Office also prepared bells and staves, it is probable that a morris was introduced. The torch-bearers to this mask were eight Moorish friars, with head-pieces of crimson satin. The remaining two masks were at Shrovetide. On the Sunday was a double mask, with an assault in it. The Queen's maids were rifled and rescued again.[1] One party consisted of eight Swart Rutters, in black and white jerkins and long breeches, with laced hats, dags, and silvered and gilded partisans ; the other probably of six Hungarians in blue and purple cloth of gold. The torch-bearers were six Almayns, and the music a drum and fife. On the Tuesday was another double mask, but of women, being six Fisher Wives and eight Market Wives, dressed in bodies and kirtles of various cloths of gold and silver, with elaborate trimmings, and wearing wicker head-pieces painted with red and silver, and hats covered with gold lawn. They

[1] Il Schifanoya to Mantuan Ambassador at Brussels (*V. P.* vii. 27), ' Last evening at the Court a double mummery was played : one set of mummers rifled the Queen's ladies, and the other set, with wooden swords and bucklers, recovered the spoil. Then at the dance the Queen performed her part, the Duke of Norfolk being her partner, in superb array.'

seem to have had Fishermen for torch-bearers, and six minstrels in yellow damask, as well as a drum and fife.

Four masks were given during the summer of 1559. One was on 24 May in a banqueting house built at Westminster, for the entertainment of the Duke of Montmorency, Constable of France, who came to ratify a treaty. This was of Astronomers, in long robes of Turkey red cloth of gold, with torch-bearers in green damask. The second was in a banqueting house at Greenwich on 11 July, after a tilt by the Queen's pensioners. The other two were in August during the progress. One was given by the Earl of Arundel at Nonsuch on 6 August.[1] The other was in a specially built banqueting house at Lord Admiral Clinton's place of West Horsley. This last was a double mask of Shipmen, appropriate to an Admiral, in blue cloth of gold, and Country Maids. Two 'grasyers or gentillmen of the cuntrye', whose black damask gowns appear in a Revels inventory, may have acted as presenters.

The winter masks of 1559–60 were five in number. On New Year's day was a mask of six Barbarians, in red cloth of gold, with Venetian commoners in white damask for torch-bearers. On Twelfth Night was a double mask, of six Venetian Patriarchs in green, with purple head-pieces, and six Italian Women in white and crimson. They were accompanied by torch-bearers and a drum and fife. On Shrove Tuesday was another double mask, of an elaborate mythological character, for which a device of 'a rocke of founteyne' was employed. The women represented Diana in purple and three pairs of Huntress Nymphs, in carnation, purple, and blue respectively; the men Actaeon and his six fellows, in purple, with orange buskins and gilt boar-spears. They had a drum and fife and, as torch-bearers, eight Maidens in purple with variously coloured kirtles, and eight Hunters in yellow with murrey buskins. And they were accompanied by twelve hounds. It is noted in the Revels inventory that Actaeon's garments were 'all to cutt in small panes and steyned with blood'. There were also a mask on New Year's Eve and a second mask at Shrovetide.[2] One of these was of six Nusquams, allegorical personages in white, crimson, and yellow, having the breasts of their scapulars 'steyned with the posy of poco a poco'. Their torch-bearers were six Turkish commoners in murrey and white. The other was of eight Clowns in red

[1] Machyn, 204, 206.

[2] On 31 Jan. (Machyn, 221) 'ther was a play a-for her grace, the wyche the plaers plad shuche matter that they wher commondyd to leyff off, and contenent the maske cam in dansyng'.

and green, with flails and spades of gilt wood, black high-laced shoes made out of the limbs of the previous year's Moors, hedging mittens, and white gold sarcenet aprons, which were 'gyven awaye by the maskers in the queenes presence'. They had eight Hinds for torch-bearers, and a shepherd for a minstrel.[1]

[1] The succession of masks for 1558–60 is traceable with the aid of Il Schifanoya from an analysis of the following Revels documents, (*a*) an inventory of 26 March 1555 (Feuillerat, *Ed. and M.* 180), (*b*) the accounts from 26 March 1555 to 29 Sept. 1559 (Feuillerat, *Ed. and M.* 195–242; *Eliz.* 79–108), (*c*) an estimate of the cost of the 1559–60 masks (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 110), (*d*) a 'rere-account' of the uses to which the masks inventoried in (*a*) and certain stuffs subsequently issued to the Masters of the Revels had been put during 1555–60 (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 18), and (*e*) an inventory of *c.* May 1560 (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 37). There were fifteen sets of masking garments in store in 1555, Mariners, Venetian Senators, Turkish Magistrates, Greek Worthies, Albanian Warriors, Turkish Archers, Irish Kerns, Galley-Slaves (torch-bearers), Falconers (torch-bearers), Palmers (torch-bearers), Turkish Commoners (torch-bearers), Huntresses, Venuses, Nymphs, and Turkish Women. Some of these were no longer serviceable and became fees; the rest were gradually pulled to pieces during 1555–60 and used with fresh material in constructing new sets. As a result the inventory of 1560 contains none of the sets of 1555, but seventeen of later origin, Patriarchs, Actaeons, Hunters (torch-bearers to Actaeons), Nusquams, Turkish Commoners (torch-bearers to Nusquams, not the set of 1555), Barbarians, Venetian Commoners (torch-bearers to Barbarians), Clowns, Hinds (torch-bearers to Clowns), Swart Rutters, Almayns (torch-bearers to Swart Rutters, although not so described), Moors, Diana and her Nymphs, Maidens (torch-bearers to Diana), Italian Women, Fishwives, and Marketwives. The rere-account shows that in the interim between 1555 and 1560 eleven other sets had come into existence and been picked to pieces again. There were Almayns (not the 1560 set), Palmers (not the 1555 set), Irishmen (not the 1555 set), Hungarians, Conquerors, Mariners, or Shipmen (not the 1555 set), Moorish friars (torch-bearers), Fishermen (torch-bearers), Astronomers, and unnamed torch-bearers to Astronomers and to Patriarchs. A number of ecclesiastical costumes had also been made, of which a few were still in store in 1560, and which evidently belong to the mask described by Il Schifanoya. It seems clear from the *Revels Accounts* that the only new mask between 1555 and the end of Mary's reign was one of Almayns, Pilgrims, and Irishmen on 25 April 1557 (Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 225). This accounts for three of the twelve interim sets. The other nine and the seventeen in the 1560 inventory must all be Elizabethan. The documents give or indicate dates for most of them. A process of exclusions obliges us to place the Conquerors, Moors, and Hungarians in the early part of 1559. Here are three vacant dates. Il Schifanoya tells us that there was a second company of maskers on Shrove Sunday, besides the Swart Rutters, whom the accounts assign to that day. The Hungarians would be appropriate antagonists to the Swart Rutters. There were also two unspecified masks at the time of the Coronation, one on the next day, 16 Jan., the other 'on the Sondaye seven nighte after the Coronacion', which as 15 Jan. was itself a Sunday, probably means 22 rather than 29 Jan. As part of the garments of the Moors had previously been used for the Conquerors (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 20), the Moors must have been the later of the two. The

The absence of *Revels Accounts* renders it impossible to construct a full catalogue of masks between the Shrovetide of 1560 and the Christmas of 1571; but there is every reason to suppose that they were given yearly, and a number of scattered notices have survived. Brantôme, who came to court during October 1561, in the train of the Grand Prior Francis of Lorraine, describes a mask of Wise and Foolish Virgins, performed by Elizabeth's maids of honour, who did the Frenchmen the courtesy of taking them out to dance.[1] There was a mask at Baynard's Castle when Elizabeth visited the Earl of Pembroke on 15 January 1562, a 'grett maske' at Whitehall on 18 January after the performance of *Gorboduc* by the Inner Temple, and on 1 February 'the goodlyest masket that ever was seen', which came in procession from the city to the court.[2] During May 1562 elaborate masks were in preparation for a projected meeting between Elizabeth and Mary of Scots at Nottingham Castle.[3] The meeting never came off, but a scheme for the masks is preserved, and is sufficiently detailed to show the point which had been reached in the evolution of the form. It covers the entertainment of three successive nights. On the first a prison of Extreme Oblivion, under the keepership of Argus or Circumspection, is to be made in the hall. A mask of six or eight ladies is to enter, leading Discord and False Report captive, and preceded by Pallas riding on a unicorn and Prudentia and Temperantia on two lions. Pallas is to declare the intention

masks of 11 July and 6 August 1559 were probably not given at the royal cost, as the Revels documents are quite silent about them. My list agrees in the main with that in Wallace, i. 199, which however has some errors. There is no evidence for masks on 2 Feb. and 6 Feb. 1559. The list in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* xiii, is incomplete.

[1] Brantôme, *Hommes illustres et Capitaines françois* (ed. Buchon, i. 312), 'La reyne . . . donna un soir à soupper, où après se fit un ballet de ses filles, qu'elle avoit ordonné et dressé, représentant les vierges de l'Évangile, desquelles les unes avoient leurs lampes allumées, et les autres n'avoient ny huille ny feu, et en demandoient. Ces lampes estoient d'argent, fort gentiment faictes et elabourées; et les dames estoient très-belles, bien honnestes et bien apprises, qui prindrent nous autres François pour dancer.'

[2] Machyn, 275, 276, 'The furst day of Feybruary at nyght was the goodlyest masket cam owt of London that ever was seen, of a C. and d' [? 150] gorgyously be-sene, and a C. cheynes of gold, and as for trumpettes and drumes, and as for torchelyghte a ij hundered, and so to the cowrt, and dyvers goodly men of armes in gylt harnes, and Julyus Sesar played.' The last word is in a later hand, and according to Wallace, i. 200, is a nineteenth-century forgery.

[3] *M. S. C.* i. 144; Collier, i. 178; from *Lansd. MS.* v, f. 126, endorsed 'Maij 1562'. A warrant of 10 May 1562 for the delivery of silks for masks and revels to the Master of the Revels is in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 114.

to the queen in verse; Discord and False Report are to be committed to the prison; and 'then the trompettes to blowe, and thinglishe ladies to take the nobilite of the straunger and daunce'. On the second night the structure in the hall is to be a castle called the Court of Plenty, whereof Ardent Desire and Perpetuity, serving respectively Prudentia and Temperantia, are to be porters. The mask proper is again to consist of six or eight ladies, accompanied by Friendship on an elephant, drawing Peace in a chariot to dwell in the castle. Friendship is to speak explanatory verses. 'Then shall springe out of the cowrte of plentie conditties of all sortes of wynes, duringe which tyme thinglishe lordes shall maske with the Scottishe ladyes.' The third night's mask is to be a double one. Disdain and Prepensed Malice are to draw in six or eight lady maskers, sitting in an orchard of golden apples, and to demand on behalf of Pluto the surrender either of Discord and False Report, or of Peace. These are to be followed by six or eight lords, with Discretion and Valiant Courage or Hercules. Discretion is to offer the services of Valiant Courage as champion. Prudentia and Temperantia are to let down tokens of peace from their castle, a grandgarde and a girdle and sword, which are to be laid at the feet of the queens. There is to be an assault between Valiant Courage and Disdain and Prepensed Malice. 'After this shall come out of the garden, the vj, or viij, ladies maskers, with a song, that shalbe made herevppon, as full of armony, as maye be devised.' One may note the allegorical theme, the use both of fixed and of movable pageants, the persistent episode of the assault at arms, the gifts to the principal spectators, and the somewhat formal speeches of the presenters, eked out on the last night with a song, but not yet broken up into dramatic dialogue. The draft makes it clear that English and Scots are to mingle in the dance, but not quite so clear that the invitation is to come from the maskers, although that was probably the intention.[1]

There were 'gret mummeres and masks' again at Baynard's Castle on each of the four days, 17–20 February 1563, devoted to celebrating the double wedding of Lord Herbert of Cardiff to Lady Catherine Talbot and of Lord Talbot to Lady Anne Herbert. But we are not told that Elizabeth was present, although it is not improbable.[2] On 9 June 1564 there was a device for the entertainment of Artus de Cossé, Seigneur

[1] I strongly suspect that the second night's mask was really intended to be one of lords, not ladies.

[2] Machyn, 300. Machyn, 215, 222, 248, 288, 300, records several masks in the City during 1559–63. The diary ends in August 1563.

de Gonnor, who came as ambassador from France to confirm the treaty of Troyes. It was of a martial character and entailed the preparation of a castle and an arbour and three masks, and a total cost of £87 9*s.* 6*d.*[1] A month later, on 5 July, Elizabeth was entertained at the house of Sir Richard Sackville by maskers in her colours of black and white, who presented a sonnet in her honour. The host was the father of Thomas Sackville, afterwards Earl of Dorset, one of the authors of *Gorboduc* and of *The Mirror for Magistrates*.[2] During the winter of 1564–5 there were several masks, apparently given in close relation to the plays of the same season. One was at Christmas and another, of Hunters and Muses, on 18 February, while at Shrovetide no less than four were made ready, although only two, of Tilters and of Satyrs, were actually seen.[3] On 16 July 1565 Elizabeth attended the marriage at Durham Place of Henry, son of Sir Francis Knollys, to Margaret, daughter of Sir Ambrose

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 116, 'the ix[th] of Iune repayringe and new makinge of thre maskes with thare hole furniture and diuers devisses and a castle ffor ladies and a harboure ffor lords and thre harrolds and iiij trompetours too bringe in the devise with the men of armes and showen at the courtte of Richmond before the Quenes Maiestie and the ffrench embassitours, &c.'

[2] Froude, vii. 199; De Silva to Philip (*Sp. P.* i. 367, 385), 'after supper . . . the Queen came out to the hall, which was lit with many torches, where the comedy was represented. I should not have understood much of it, if the Queen had not interpreted, as she told me she would do. They generally deal with marriage in the comedies . . . The comedy ended, and then there was a mask of certain gentlemen who entered dressed in black and white, which the Queen told me were her colours, and after dancing a while one of them approached and handed the Queen a sonnet in English, praising her.' A banquet followed, ending at 2 a.m.

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 116, 'Cristmas . . . canvas to couer diuers townes and howsses and other devisses and clowds for a maske and a showe and a play by the childerne of the chaple. . . . The xviij[th] of Fabruarie . . . provicions for a play maid by Sir Percivall Hartts sones with a mask of huntars and diuers devisses and a rocke, or hill for the ix musses to singe vppone with a vayne of sarsnett dravven vpp and downe before them. . . . Shroftid . . . foure maskes too of them nott occupied nor sene with thare hole furniture which be verie fayr and riche of old stuf butt new garnished with frenge and tassells to seme new'; cf. De Silva to Philip of the revel after a tilt on 5 March (*Sp. P.* i. 404). It began after supper with 'a comedy in English of which I understood just as much as the Queen told me. The plot was founded on the question of marriage, discussed between Juno and Diana, Juno advocating marriage and Diana chastity. Jupiter gave a verdict in favour of matrimony, after many things had passed on both sides in defence of the respective arguments. The Queen turned to me and said, "This is all against me". After the comedy there was a masquerade of Satyrs, or wild gods, who danced with the ladies, and when this was finished there entered 10 parties of 12 gentlemen each, the same who fought in the foot tourney, and these, all armed as they were, danced with the ladies; a very novel ball, surely.'

Cave; and the entertainment included two masks.[1] Similarly, at Shrovetide 1566, she was present at the marriage of Henry Earl of Southampton, to Mary Browne, daughter of Anthony Lord Montague, and on 1 July 1566 at that of Thomas Mildmay to Frances, sister of Thomas Earl of Sussex, and on each occasion there was a mask with an oration 'spoken and pronounced' by Mr. Pound of Lincoln's Inn. The July mask introduced Venus, Diana, Pallas, and Juno.[2] We know that there were four masks during the winter of 1567–8, and that there were masks during those of 1568–9, 1569–70, and 1570–1, but practically we know no more.[3] For 1571–2, however, fuller information is available, since with this winter begins the series of detailed Revels Accounts, which extends, with occasional interruptions, to 1589. There were six masks, on unspecified dates. For two of these the costumes were 'translated' from old sets. Four were new made; one of yellow cloth of gold, with torch-bearers in red and yellow changeable taffeta; one of crimson, purple, and green cloth of gold, with torch-bearers in red damask; one of white and black branched loom-work, with torch-bearers in blue and yellow changeable taffeta; and one in murrey satin, with torch-bearers in changeable taffeta of an unspecified colour. The maskers were six or eight in number in each case, and wore vizards, gloves, at 6*d*. a pair, and strange heads. Devices of canvas were made for some or all of them. One set carried flowers of silk and gold, and before them went a child dressed as Mercury, with two special torch-bearers, who made a speech, and offered the Queen three similar flowers, signifying victory, peace, and plenty.[4] On 15 June 1572 an elaborate mask was given in honour of another French embassy under the Duc de Montmorency. The theme evidently bore some resemblance to the abandoned devices of 1562.[5] A vizard was made for Argus and a collar and shackles and curls of black silk for Discord. There were two pageants, a castle upon which

[1] Hume, *Year after Armada*, 283; De Silva to Philip (*Sp. P.* i. 452), 'a ball, a tourney, and two masks'. These were after supper and ended at 1.30 a.m.

[2] Pound's speeches are in *Rawl. Poet. MS.* 108 (*Bodl. MS.* 14601), f. 24; De Silva to Philip (July 1566, *Sp. P.* i. 565), 'a masquerade and a long ball, after which they entered in new disguises for a foot tournament'. The chief challenger was Ormond. On Pound's career as a masker and its strange end, cf. ch. xxiii.

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 119, 'the altering and newe makinge of sixe maskes out of ould stuff with torche bearers thervnto wherof iiij^{or} hathe byne shewene before vs, and two remayne vnshewen', 124, 125, 126.

[4] Ibid. 129, 134, 139, 146.

[5] Fleay, 19; Brotanek, 25. But the resemblances are only partial, cf. *M. S. C.* i. 144.

Lady Peace was brought in, and a chariot measuring 14 ft. by 8 ft. with a rock and fountain for Apollo and the nine Muses. These were probably the dancers. The performance is called both a 'mask' and a 'triumph'. The total cost was £409 3*s.* 2*d.*, exclusive of the value of stuffs supplied by the Wardrobe, and it is recorded that the chariot was broken and spoiled. Payments were made to a Mistress Swego, apparently for head-dressing, and to a 'muzisian that towghte the ladies'; also to Haunce Eottes for 'patternes', and to Petrucio, for his 'travell and paynes' taken in the preparations.[1] This is doubtless Petrucio Ubaldini, and it may also be assumed that the 'M^r^. Alphonse', who apparently had the general direction or 'apoyntment' of the proceedings, and wore a pair of cloth-of-gold buskins, was Alfonso Ferrabosco, the musician.

This example attests the continuance of the spectacular element in the mask. Its literary aspect also finds illustration during 1572. The scene was again a house of Lord Montague, who was celebrating the double wedding of his son and daughter to those of Sir William Dormer. The dancers were eight kinsmen of the host, dressed as Venetians. There was a long introductory narrative, spoken by a boy-actor. The motive of this was suggested by the supposed community of blood between the Montagues of England and the Montagues of Venice. The actor represented a boy of the English house, who had been taken prisoner by the Turks, together with four English soldiers, who were the torch-bearers. He had been rescued by Italian Montagues, who were returning with him to Italy, when a storm drove them on the shores of Kent, and they took the opportunity to visit their kinsmen in London. After the mask there was a shorter speech by Master Thomas Browne, whom the actor drew from the company, and presented to the maskers to replace him as their 'trounchman', and the maskers then took their leaves. The author of the verses was George Gascoigne. They contain no indication that Elizabeth was present, and therefore she probably was not. But they furnish a very good example of the way in which introductory speeches, still stiff and undramatic, were used to give topical point and meaning to the disguises assumed by maskers.[2] With this Montague mask may be compared that at the wedding of Henry Unton, represented in one of

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 153.

[2] G. Gascoigne, *A devise of a Maske for the right honorable Viscount Mountacute* (*Works*, i. 75, from *The Posies* of 1575). The date is fixed by Thomas Giles's letter.

the scenes from his life and death by which his portrait, now in the National Portrait Gallery, is surrounded. The wedding party is shown at table in a great chamber, overlooking a hall below, in which sit six minstrels. At each end of the hall are steps, and up and down these and over the floor of the chamber passes the mask procession, a drummer, a 'trounchman' with a paper in his hand, Mercury, Diana, six Nymphs, and ten Cupids, five white and five black, as torch-bearers.[1]

Finally, a curious document of this same year, 1572, indicates the widespread popularity which the mask had acquired, as a form of social entertainment. It is preserved amongst Lord Burghley's papers, and is a complaint by one Thomas Giles against the Yeoman of the Revels, who had the custody of the Queen's masks, and made a practice of letting them out on hire to persons of all degrees, noble and mean, both in the city and in the country.[2] Thomas Giles was a haberdasher, and from time to time supplied goods to the Revels. He bases his complaint mainly on the damage done to the royal property, but at the end he allows it to appear that he himself made a business of letting out masking apparel for hire, and found his prices undercut by those of the Yeoman. He appends a list of a score of occasions during the past year on which loans had taken place. The garments lent appear to have been mostly those made for the Court festivities of the previous winter. One set is described as 'the coper clothe of golde gownes which was last made'. This must have been the mask of Muses given on 15 June. It was lent with another mask, 'into the contre to the maryage of the dowter of my lorde Montague', at some date between 15 September and 6 October. This was the occasion of Gascoigne's verses just described, although it must have been the other mask, a mask of men, which those verses presented.

It may be collected from scattered items of expenditure that the Court masks of 1572–3 were two in number.[3] There

[1] The reproductions in Strutt, *Manners and Customs*, iii, pl. xi, and Withington, i. 208, omit the wedding table. The pictures must be later than Sir H. Unton's death in 1596. Ashmole, *Berks*, iii. 313, dates his wedding with Dorothy, daughter of Sir Thomas Wroughton of Broad Hinton, Wilts, in 1580.

[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 409.

[3] Ibid., *Eliz.* 171–81, 'gloves for maskers', 'the lordes gloves', 'the torcheberers gloves', 'ladye maskers', 'women maskers', 'Haunce Eottes for painting of patternes for maskes', 'the masks on New Yeres daye', 'the dubble mask', 'a keye for Janus', 'ffyn white lam to make snoballs', 'spunges for snoballs', 'musk kumfettes . . . corianders . . . clove cumfettes . . . synamon kumfettes . . . rose water . . . spike water . . .

was a mask of Janus on 1 January, with a snow-storm of comfits and a presentation of snowballs, made out of sponges covered with fine lamb's-wool, to the Queen. And on some later date there was a double mask of men and women, representing Fishermen and probably Fruit-women. Haunce Eottes is again said to have painted 'patternes' for the masks. There are some traces of a mask, with women, as well as Mariners and Turks, in it, when Elizabeth received the French ambassador Mareschal de Retz at Canterbury during the progress of 1573; and there was one at Greenwich, probably not at the royal expense, for the marriage of William Drury in the following November or December.[1] For the winter of 1573–4 a complete list is preserved.[2] There was a mask of Lance Knights in blue satin, with torch-bearers in black and yellow taffeta, on 27 December; a mask of Foresters in green satin and cloaks of crimson sarcenet, with Wild Men in moss and ivy as torch-bearers, on New Year's Day; and a mask of Sages in 'counterfeit' cloth of gold, with torch-bearers in red damask, on Twelfth Night. There were six maskers in each case. The Foresters were equipped with a hollow tree and with comfits made to resemble wild fruits; also with horns garnished with silver, 'which hornes', says the Revels account, 'the maskers detayned and yet doeth kepe them against the will of all the officers'. At Candlemas Haunce Eottes made designs for a mask of six ladies in green satin and gold sarcenet, representing Virtues, and carrying lights and 'properties', including a silk tree, in specially made candlesticks. Perfumes were prepared to burn at the end of matches, and speeches for delivery to Her Majesty written in fair text. But after all the mask was not shown 'for the tediusnesse of the playe that night'. Finally there were two masks on Shrove Tuesday. One was of seven Warriors, with a shipmaster to utter a speech, and six torch-bearers; the other of seven ladies, also with a 'tronchwoman', and torch-bearers. Probably this was a double mask, and in some way there came into it nine children, who had been drilled and taught their speeches by one Nicholas Newdigate, and in various ways gave a good deal of trouble.[3] During

gynger cumfettes . . . all whiche served for fflakes of yse and hayle stones in the maske of Ianvs the roze water sweetened the balls made for snow-balles presented to her Maiestie by Ianvs', 'a nett for the ffishers maskers', 'berdes for fyshers vj', 'curled heare for fyshers capps', 'roches counterfet . . . whitings . . . thornebackes . . . smeltes . . . mackerells . . . fflownders', 'wooll to stuf the fishes', 'banketting frutes', 'basketes of ffrute', 'mowldes to cast the frutes and ffishes in'.

[1] Ibid. 183, 191.

[2] Ibid. 193–221.

[3] Cf. p. 87.

the winter of 1574–5 I can only trace with confidence one mask, on an uncertain date. It was a mask of six Pedlars, who had little hampers, and looking-glasses with posies written on them in fine yellow paint.[1] There were not improbably others, the details of which cannot now be disentangled in the Revels Accounts from those relating to plays. A mask, 'for riches of aray, of an incredibl cost', was planned as part of the Kenilworth festivities of July 1575; but was not in the end performed.[2] Nothing is known of the masks during the winter of 1575–6, for the Revels Accounts are missing. For Twelfth Night 1577 a 'longe' mask was prepared, of six dancers in murrey satin, with torch-bearers in crimson damask. There were to have been seven speeches 'framed correspondent to the daie', and Nicholas Newdigate again trained boys to deliver these. But for some reason the mask was put off, and given on Shrove Tuesday without any speeches at all.[3] The Revels Accounts of 1577–8 are missing. A mask by Henry Goldingham was given at Norwich on 21 August 1578 during the progress. It was of Gods and Goddesses, who entered the privy chamber with a presenter, torch-bearers, and musicians, marched about the room and gave characteristic gifts, but apparently did not dance.[4] On 11 January 1579 there was a double mask for the entertainment of the French ambassador, M. de Simier, who had come about the Alençon marriage. Patterns of the mask were submitted for approval to the Lord Chamberlain. One party consisted of six Amazons, the other of six Knights.[5] Each party had its torch-bearers and a 'troocheman', who made a speech to the Queen and delivered her a table with the speech written upon it. These speeches had been translated into Italian and inscribed upon the tables by Petruchio Ubaldini. The Amazons and Knights danced together and afterwards fought at barriers. Some of the plumes which had been hired for the Knights were 'dropt with torches', and the Revels Office had to pay damages for them. Patterns were also shown to the Lord Chamberlain of a 'Mores' mask

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 234–46, 'vj bandes for hattes for maskers', 'gloves for . . . maskers', '23° Decembris . . . Mirors or lookingglasses for the pedlers mask xij small at ij^{s} the peece and vj greater at iiij^{s} the peece', '29° Decembris . . . ffayer wryting of pozies for the mask', '6° Ianuarii . . . ix little hampers at xx^{d} the peece for the pedlers mask', 'ffyne yolow to wryte vpon the mirrors'.

[2] Laneham, 33; cf. chh. iv, p. 123, and xxiv.

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 264–70.

[4] Cf. ch. xxiv.

[5] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 286, 294; *Sp. P.* ii. 627, 630, 'an entertainment in imitation of a tournament, between six ladies and a like number of gentlemen who surrendered to them'. Mr. Tresham and Mr. Knowles were Knights.

intended for Shrove Tuesday, but this seems to have fallen through.[1] I do not know whether the invention of the Court poets had failed, or whether for some other reason Elizabeth had become discontent with masks; but, although there are full Revels Accounts for the winters of 1579–80 and 1580–1, and although plays were numerous, no single performance of a mask is recorded. But the spirit of revelry awoke in 1581, at the coming of French commissioners to complete negotiations for the Anjou marriage in the spring, followed by that of Anjou himself in the autumn. Patterns of masks were prepared and the construction of a mount begun in March.[2] These were not proceeded with at the time, and the famous tilt before the Fortress of Perfect Beauty was substituted as an entertainment for the commissioners. But in the winter there were two masks, and amongst the devices employed were a mount with a castle on the top of it, a dragon, an artificial tree, an artificial lion, and a horse made of wood.[3] These details suggest a revival of the scheme abandoned in the previous spring, for the personal delectation of Anjou.

Court masks are but little in evidence during the next few years. There was one of ladies, with torch-bearers and eight boys, on 5 January 1583, and during the same winter one of Seamen was prepared, but not brought into use.[4] There was a mask in 1583–4, of which no details are given; while for 1585–6 and 1586–7 no information, in the absence of the Revels Accounts, is forthcoming.[5] The accounts for 1584–5 and 1587–8 have a general reference to masks in their headings, which may be no more than common form.[6] In September 1589, however, a mask was prepared to be sent into Scotland, as a compliment to James VI on the occasion of his wedding to Anne of Denmark.[7] It does not appear to have been a very sumptuous affair, and only cost the Revels Office £17 10*s.* 10*d.* We are not told what the maskers represented.

[1] Ibid. 308.

[2] Ibid. 340, 345, '1° Aprilis 1581, what monnie is to be allowed in prest for certayne shewes to be had at Whitehal . . . The Mounte, Dragon with the fyer workes, Castell with the fallyng sydes, Tree with shyldes, Hermytage and hermytt, Savages, Enchaunter, Charryott, and incydentes to theis cc markes'.

[3] Ibid. 344 (table), 346.

[4] Ibid. 349.

[5] Ibid. 360 (table). The *Jervoise MSS.* (*H. M. C. Various MSS.* iv. 163) contain verses dated 1586 for a mask from Basingstoke to Richard Pawlett, doubtless a kinsman of the Marquis of Winchester at Basing.

[6] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 365, 378. A mask followed the play of *Catiline*, with which Lord Burghley was entertained at Gray's Inn on 16 Jan. 1588 (*M. S. C.* i. 179).

[7] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 392.

There were six of them, with vizards and falchions, in purple coats, crimson bases, and orange and purple and white mantles. They had torch-bearers in red and yellow damask, and four persons garlanded with flowers 'to vtter speches'. The description of the torch-bearers reads uncommonly like that of the torch-bearers to the abandoned mask of Seamen, and if they wore 'translated' garments of 1583, there cannot have been much masking in the interval.

After 1589 the Revels Accounts altogether fail us, and although it is probable that the mask shared in the general renewal of festivity which followed the passing of the Spanish peril, we have only side-lights upon it during the last decade of the reign. Certainly it was still flourishing in the winter of 1594–5, when one Arthur Throgmorton planned to use it, with a rather skilful introduction of some personal abasement and the gift of a jewel, as a means of recovering the forfeited favour of the Queen. The occasion seems to have been the wedding of William Earl of Derby, and Lady Elizabeth Vere, granddaughter of Burghley, on 26 January 1595.[1] It was in this same winter, too, that a very magnificent Shrovetide mask was brought to Court by the men of Gray's Inn, as a wind-up to their notable Christmas revels under the Prince of Purpoole. Of this a detailed account is preserved in the *Gesta Grayorum*, with songs and speeches which can be assigned respectively to Thomas Campion and Francis Davison. These had for theme a controversy between certain adventurous knights and the sea-god Proteus, and for object

[1] Arthur Throgmorton to Robert Cecil (*Hatfield MSS.* v. 99; cf. *Sh. Homage*, 158), 'Matter of mirth from a good mind can minister no matter of malice, both being, as I believe, far from such sourness (and for myself I will answer for soundness). I am bold to write my determination, grounded upon grief and true duty to the Queen, thankfulness to my lord of Derby (whose honourable brother honoured my marriage), and to assure you I bear no spleen to yourself. If I may I mind to come in a masque, brought in by the nine muses, whose music, I hope, shall so modify the easy softened mind of her Majesty as both I and mine may find mercy. The song, the substance I have herewith sent you, myself, whilst the singing, to lie prostrate at her Majesty's feet till she says she will save me. Upon my resurrection the song shall be delivered by one of the muses, with a ring made for a wedding ring set round with diamonds, and with a ruby like a heart placed in a coronet, with this inscription *Elizabetha potest*. I durst not do this before I had acquainted you here with, understanding her Majesty had appointed the masquers, which resolution hath made me the unreadier: yet, if this night I may know her Majesty's leave and your liking, I hope not to come too late, though the time be short for such a show and my preparations posted for such a presence. I desire to come in before the other masque, for I am sorrowful and solemn, and my stay shall not be long. I rest upon your resolution, which must be for this business to-night or not at all.'

the flattery of Elizabeth, the virtue of whose presence obliges Proteus to release the knights from their durance in an Adamantine Rock.[1] Of the place of this mask in the history of the literary form something will be said at a later point.

The gallantry of Gray's Inn was emulated a few years later by the Middle Temple, who, after presenting several masks in their own hall during the Christmas revels of their Prince d'Amour, did their devoir at Court on Twelfth Night with a mask in which the nine Passions issued from a Heart. The mask was followed by a barriers, and preceded by a cavalcade through the streets of a type of which examples have already been noted in 1377 and 1559.[2] In the summer of 1600 one of Elizabeth's maids of honour, Anne, daughter of Elizabeth Lady Russell, left the Court to be married to Henry Lord Herbert, son of the Earl of Worcester. The Queen was present at the wedding on 16 June. She dined at Lady Russell's house in Blackfriars, and supped and lodged for the night in that of Lord Cobham hard by. After supper a mask came in. Eight Muses, represented by maids of honour and others, were come to seek their lost companion. After they had done their performance, they wooed the Queen to dance. She was not proof against the ready tongue of Mary Fitton, and complied. 'Elle dansa gayement et de belle disposition,' says the French ambassador, M. de Boississe, who was present.[3]

[1] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 417, and ch. xxiv.

[2] Cf. J. A. Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, 9, and *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 416, where, however, the date suggested is the Christmas of 1599–1600. But the Court was not in London that winter, and the indications of days of the week agree with 1597–8. The manuscript description written by Rudyerd is dated 'anno ab aula condita 27'. The Middle Temple hall was built in 1572. The masks in this hall were on 31 Dec. and 7 and 21 Jan. The maskers were accompanied to Court on 6 Jan. by nine torch-bearers carrying devices, eleven knights, eleven squires, and a hundred other torches, as well as trumpeters and heralds. 'Sur Martino', no doubt Richard Martin, the Prince d'Amour, was their leader. Doubtless they took out ladies, as Mrs. Nevill, afterwards a maid of honour, is said to have 'borne the bell away' in the revels.

[3] Boississe, i. 415. He says that some gentlemen masked with the *filles*, of which there is no trace in the other accounts. Letters from Lady Russell about the wedding are in *Cecil Papers*, x. 121, 175, and it is also referred to by Chamberlain, 79, 83. 'I doubt not but you have heard of the great mariage at the Lady Russell's . . . and of the maske of eight maides of honour and other gentlewomen in name of the muses that came to seeke one of theire fellowes', and by Rowland Whyte (*Sydney Papers*, ii. 195, 197, 201, 203), 'Mrs Fitton led, and after they had done all their own ceremonies, these eight Ladies Maskers chose eight Ladies more to dance the measures. Mrs Fitton went to the Queen, and wooed her to dance; her Majesty asked what she was. "Affection," she said. "Affection!" said the Queen, "Affection is false." Yet her Majesty rose and danced.' A picture of the Marcus Gheeraerts school (cf. L. Cust in *Trans.*

Finally, in the spring of 1602, negotiations were passing between Sir Robert Cecil and Sir John Popham on behalf of the Middle Temple, for some entertainment to gratify the Queen, for which the benchers were prepared to contribute 200 marks.[1] Probably this was a mask, but whether and when it actually came off is not known. It may have been designed to celebrate the coming of the Duke of Nevers and other Frenchmen in the following April, and it may have been the mask a song from which was copied by John Manningham, a member of the Middle Temple, on a fly-leaf of his diary with the date 'Nov. 2'.[2]

Under James I the material for tracing the history of the mask becomes remarkably abundant, owing to the regular practice, of which the *Gesta Grayorum* is the only Elizabethan example, of issuing elaborate descriptions, with copies of the songs and speeches used, for the information of those unable to be present, and the incidental glorification of performers, poets, and producers.[3] In view of the full details compiled from these descriptions and other sources in the bibliographical appendix, a brief chronicle will suffice for a conclusion of this chapter. The main factors to be borne in mind are, firstly, the personal participation of Queen Anne, who took a special delight in all kinds of spectacle and revelry;[4] secondly, the

Walpole Soc. iii. 22) probably representing Elizabeth's passage through Blackfriars on this occasion is extant in two versions at Melbury and Sherborne, and has often been reproduced; e. g. in *Shakespeare's England*, i. *f.p.*

[1] Popham to Cecil, 8 Feb. 1602 (*Hatfield MSS.* xii. 47), 'I have so dealt with some of the Benchers of the Middle Temple as I have brought that the House will be willing to bear 200 marks towards the charge of what is wished to be done, to her Majesty's good liking, and if the young gentlemen will be drawn in to perform what is of their part, I hope it will be effected. Some of the young men have their humors, but I hope that will be over-ruled, for I send for them as soon as other business of her Majesty is dispatched. But the Ancients of the House, who wish all to be done to her Majesty's best content, depend upon your favour if anything through young men's error should not have that carriage in the course of it, as they would wish it might not yet be imputed unto them.' There is no reference to any mask in the records of the Middle Temple, which in 1601–2 kept a 'solemn' but not a 'grand' Christmas.

[2] Manningham, 1, 'Song to the Queene at the Maske at Court, Nov. 2'. The Song begins, 'Mighty Princes of a fruitfull land'. The November of 1602 is the only one covered by the period of the diary; but Elizabeth was then at Richmond, rather out of reach of a lawyers' mask.

[3] An Italian model for such printed descriptions may be found in that of G. Cecchi's Florentine *Esaltazione della Croce* (1589); cf. A. D'Ancona, *Sacre Rappresentazioni*, iii. 1, 235; Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, iv. 282.

[4] J. A. Lester, *Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama* (*Haverford Essays*, 1909), 145, notes the vogue of the mask at Holyrood under Mary Stuart and the *pompae* written for such occasions

employment of such poets as Jonson, Campion, Daniel, Beaumont, and Chapman, to give the masks their literary setting ;[1] and thirdly, the great development of the scenic element through the mechanical and decorative genius of Inigo Jones. Anne gave her first mask, of which no details are preserved, as a welcome to Prince Henry, when he came to join the Court at Winchester during the plague-stricken wanderings which filled the autumn of 1603. An English official describes it as 'a gallant mask', and the French ambassador, more critically, as less a '*ballet*' than a '*masquarade champêtre*'. At any rate it whetted the appetite of the Court for more to come, and there was soon talk of the splendours foreshadowed for the following Christmas.[2] This, still owing to the plague, was held at Hampton Court. The principal mask was danced by the Queen, with Lady Bedford and other ladies of the court, on 8 January. Through the influence of Lady Bedford, Samuel Daniel was employed as poet, and produced his *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*. Queen Elizabeth's wardrobe was ransacked to provide material for the costumes. The lords of the Court, led by the Duke of Lennox, danced a mask of Indian and Chinese knights on 1 January, and certain Scotchmen one resembling a sword dance on Twelfth Night; but of neither of these has a full description been preserved. The masks of subsequent Christmases took place at Whitehall, where in 1607 the old timber banqueting house of 1581 gave way to a permanent structure designed to house them with magnificence. The Queen's mask of 1604–5 was the *Mask of Blackness*, and began the long and fruitful co-operation of Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones. It was on Twelfth Night, and did honour to the creation of Prince Charles as Duke of York. A mask of Juno and Hymenaeus

by Buchanan. He asserts that Anne acquired the taste for masks during her thirteen years' residence in Scotland, but in fact he cites no example of a mask proper during 1590–1603, and only one, in 1581, during the reign of James. There were other forms of mimetic revelry. The pageants introduced by Bastien Pagez into a banquet at the baptism of James in 1566 and accompanied with verses by Buchanan are analogous to those at the baptism of Henry Frederick in 1594 (*Somers Tracts*, ii. 179).

[1] Jonson told Drummond in 1619 (*Conversations*, 4), 'That next himself, only Fletcher and Chapman could make a mask'. No independent mask by Fletcher is known, and that in *The Maid's Tragedy* is probably Beaumont's. Fletcher may have written the Triumph of Time in *Four Plays or Morall Representations*, which is practically a mask.

[2] Lodge, iii. 58; Beaumont to Villeroy (27 Oct. 1603) in *King's MS.* 124, f. 175, 'Elle fit jl y' a quelques jourz vn ballet ou pour mieux dire vne masquarade champêtre. Car il n'y avoit ni ordre ni depense. Mais Elle se propose d'en faire d'autres plus beaux cet hiver en recompense et semble que le Roy et ses Principaux Ministres, qui sont toujourz en Jalousie de son Esprit, soient bien aises de le voir occupé en cet exercice.'

given on 27 December by friends of Sir Philip Herbert, in celebration of his marriage to Lady Susan Vere, has not been preserved. The only Christmas masks of the next two winters were of similar origin. Jonson's *Hymenaei* was given at the wedding of Robert Earl of Essex and Lady Frances Howard on 5 January 1606, and a mask of the Knights of Apollo by Thomas Campion, who had had a share in the verses for the Gray's Inn mask of 1595, at that of James Lord Hay and Honora Denny on 7 January 1607. As a mask must be accounted, I suppose, the extraordinary exhibition of *Solomon and the Queen of Sheba* before James and Christian of Denmark at Theobalds in July 1606, of which a description is forthcoming from the satirical pen of Sir John Harington.[1] By the winter of 1607–8 the new banqueting house was ready, and the series of Queen's masks was resumed with Jonson's

[1] Harington, i. 349, 'One day, a great feast was held, and, after dinner, the representation of Solomon his Temple and the coming of the Queen of Sheba was made, or (as I may better say) was meant to have been made, before their Majesties, by device of the Earl of Salisbury and others. But alass! as all earthly thinges do fail to poor mortals in enjoyment, so did prove our presentment hereof. The Lady who did play the Queens part, did carry most precious gifts to both their Majesties; but, forgetting the steppes arising to the canopy, overset her caskets into his Danish Majesties lap, and fell at his feet, tho I rather think it was in his face. Much was the hurry and confusion; cloths and napkins were at hand, to make all clean. His Majesty then got up and would dance with the Queen of Sheba; but he fell down and humbled himself before her, and was carried to an inner chamber, and laid on a bed of state; which was not a little defiled with the presents of the Queen which had been bestowed on his garments; such as wine, cream, jelly, beverage, cakes, spices, and other good matters. The entertainment and show went forward, and most of the presenters went backward, or fell down; wine did so occupy their upper chambers. Now did appear, in rich dress, Hope, Faith, and Charity: Hope did assay to speak, but wine rendered her endeavours so feeble that she withdrew, and hoped the King would excuse her brevity: Faith was then all alone, for I am certain she was not joyned with good works, and left the court in a staggering condition: Charity came to the King's feet, and seemed to cover the multitude of sins her sisters had committed; in some sorte she made obeysance and brought giftes, but said she would return home again, as there was no gift which heaven had not already given his Majesty. She then returned to Hope and Faith, who were both sick and spewing in the lower hall. Next came Victory, in bright armour, and presented a rich sword to the King, who did not accept it, but put it by with his hand; and, by a strange medley of versification, did endeavour to make suit to the King. But Victory did not tryumph long; for, after much lamentable utterance, she was led away like a silly captive, and laid to sleep in the outer steps of the antichamber. Now did Peace make entry, and strive to get foremoste to the King; but I grieve to tell how great wrath she did discover unto those of her attendants; and, much contrary to her semblance, most rudely made war with her olive branch, and laid on the pates of those who did oppose her coming.'

Mask of Beauty on 10 January. In a second mask, sometimes called, although not by its author, *The Hue and Cry after Cupid*, for the wedding of John Viscount Haddington and Lady Elizabeth Radcliffe on 9 February, Jonson appears to have considered that he took a definite step forward in the evolution of the mask-form, by the introduction of an anti-mask or group of grotesque dancers as a foil to the mask proper. The Queen's mask for 1608–9 was Jonson's *Mask of Queens* at Candlemas, and there was no other. During the winter of 1609–10, which was devoted to Prince Henry's mimetic barriers, there was no mask at all, unless indeed the anonymous and undated *Mask of the Twelve Months* belongs to this year. But on the following 5 June came Daniel's *Tethys' Festival*, which was the Queen's contribution to the festivities attending the creation of Henry as Prince of Wales. In 1610–11 there was a Queen's mask, Jonson's *Love Freed from Ignorance and Folly*, on 3 February, and also a Prince's mask, Jonson's *Oberon*, on 1 January. Jonson's *Love Restored* was a Prince's mask of 6 January 1612. The masks of 1612–13 were all given in celebration of the wedding of the Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine of the Rhine, Frederick V, at Shrovetide. There were three of them. Campion's *Lords' Mask* was danced by lords and ladies of the Court on the actual day of the wedding, 14 February. The other two were contributed by the Inns of Court, and each was preluded by a public procession or triumph, such as had been found natural in earlier years when a mask came from London to the palace. The Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn came by road on 15 February with a mask of Virginians by George Chapman; the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn by water on 16 February, with a mask of Olympian Knights by Francis Beaumont. This, however, they were not able to dance until 20 February. Jonson took no part in these hymeneal festivities, and may have been abroad. The masks for the wedding of Robert Earl of Somerset and Lady Frances Howard on 26 December 1613 almost vied in magnificence, and more than vied in number, with those given for the princess. The bride had passed through stormy days since Jonson's *Hymenaei* hailed her first marriage in 1606, and was to pass through stormier still. Campion was again selected as the poet for the actual wedding day. In his mask, sometimes called the *Mask of Squires*, and danced by lords and gentlemen of the Court, he had the assistance, not of Jones, but of Constantine de' Servi, who does not appear to have been very successful. Jonson's *Irish Mask*, which was given on 29 December and repeated on 3 January, was a comparatively slight performance, danced by five Englishmen

and five Scots. Thomas Middleton's *Mask of Cupid*, unfortunately lost, was an exceptional performance given not at Court, but by the City in the Merchant Taylors' hall on 4 January, after a request from the King that they should do honour to the earl. Finally the *Mask of Flowers*, the authors of which are only known by the initials I. G., W. D., and T. B., was given by Gray's Inn on 6 January, at the charges of Sir Francis Bacon, who had already taken an active part in promoting the joint Inner Temple and Gray's Inn mask of the previous year. When Anne married her favourite maid of honour, Jane Drummond, to Lord Roxborough on 2 February, she perhaps thought that another mask would be something of an anti-climax, and the performance in a little paved court at Somerset House took the shape of a pastoral, Daniel's *Hymen's Triumph*.

After the wedding carnivals of two successive years, the masks of 1614–15 and 1615–16 were comparatively insignificant, and even their chronology is not quite certain. To one of these winters belongs Jonson's *Mercury Vindicated from the Alchemists*, but it is not certain to which, and to the other his *Golden Age Restored*. In each year there were duplicate performances, on 6 and 8 January 1615 and on 1 and 6 January 1616. Both masks were danced by lords and gentlemen of the Court. That of 1615 was contrived to serve the interests of George Villiers, who was soon to replace the already tottering Somerset in the esteem of his royal master. A mask, of which no details are known, seems also to have been given by the Spanish ambassador in February 1615. Of masks elsewhere than at Court during 1603–16 there are few to record. The Princess Elizabeth seems, on at least one occasion, to have had a mask for her private delectation.[1] One by John Marston formed part of the entertainment given by the Earl of Huntingdon to Alice Countess of Derby, at Ashby in August 1607, and one by Campion part of that given by Lord Knollys to Anne at Caversham on 27 April 1613. William Browne's *Ulysses and Circe* glorified the Inner Temple feast on 13 January 1615. The palmy days of the Jacobean mask close with our period. Henry was dead; Elizabeth was gone. Anne, ailing and retired during her later years, died in 1619. She had danced her last mask in 1611. Charles made his début as an adult masker in 1618, and most of the Court masks to the end of the reign are Prince's masks. But it takes a Queen to make a Court, and the English mask had to wait for its *renouveau* until the coming of Henrietta Maria.

[1] *Chamber Accounts* (1610–11, Apparellings), 'for making ready the La: Eliz: Lodginges for a maske'.

VI

THE MASK (*continued*)

The historical sketch given in the last chapter needs to be supplemented by some analysis of the stage of development which the mask had reached, in relation to its origins, by the Jacobean period. And first of all, on the side of scenic effect. Looking back over the reign of Henry VIII, in the light of what followed, we may discover two fairly distinct types of masks. There is the mask simple, in which the dancers, with their richly hued and sparkling costumes, their torch-bearers and their musicians, may be regarded as furnishing their own decoration. There is the mask spectacular, to which added éclat is given by the pageant, mobile, or towards the end of the reign stationary, with its additional lights, its carvings and mouldings, its gilt and colours, and the elements of illusion and surprise afforded by its facilities for the concealed entry of personages. Elizabeth, perhaps as has been hinted upon grounds of economy, perhaps from the more legitimate and attractive motive of a special interest in the dancer's art, used mainly the mask simple. But the pageant was not altogether forgotten, and recurs from time to time amongst the preparations for festivities on some exceptionally elaborate scale. The most notable example is perhaps to be found in the devices for the contemplated meeting with Mary of Scots in 1562, which involved the construction of a prison, a castle, and an orchard, and of which even Henry VIII would have had no reason to be ashamed. We hear also of a rock of fountain for the mask of Diana and Actaeon in 1560, of a castle and arbour at the visit of Artus de Cossé in 1564, of a rock with a veil of sarcenet for the mask of hunters in 1565, of a chariot and castle for the visit of the Duc de Montmorency in 1572, and of a mount, a castle, an orange tree, and a house for that of the Duc d'Anjou in 1581. The Gray's Inn maskers of 1595 had their Rock Adamantine, and those of the Middle Temple about 1598 sallied forth from a Heart.

I do not know that any special inferences need be drawn from the fact that on most of these occasions the English Court was putting its best foot foremost to entertain a visitor from France, for in fact during the greater part of Elizabeth's

reign France was the only continental country of the first importance with which she maintained constant diplomatic relations.[1] Nor is enough known of the development of the French mask in the middle of the sixteenth century to make it possible to say how far, if at all, that country then gave the lead to England.[2] Brantôme reports how Catherine de Médicis would amuse herself by inventing 'quelques nouvelles danses ou quelques beaux ballets, quand il faisoit mauvais temps', and the writings of Clément Marot and Mellin de Saint-Gelais and of the Pléiade contain several sets of verses composed for the purposes of 'mommeries' and 'mascarades'.[3] I should suppose that the distinction drawn by M. de Beaumont in 1603 between a 'mascarade' and a 'ballet' corresponds pretty closely with that made above between the mask simple and the mask spectacular. The history of the 'ballet' proper in France seems to begin under Italian influences during the last quarter of the century. Its pioneer was one Baldassarino da Belgiojoso, a groom of the chamber to Catherine de Médicis and to her son Henri III, who came to France about 1555 and gallicized his name as Baltasar de Beaujoyeulx. When Henri, not yet King of France, left Paris to receive the crown of Poland in 1573, Baldassarino arranged the spectacle for his farewell. Sixteen nymphs issued from a movable rock, offered gifts, and danced in the hall. A printed description by Jean Dorat contains engravings of the rock and the dances, and verses in Latin and French, to which Ronsard and Amadis de Jamyn contributed.[4] This appears to have been a mask on lines already familiar in both France and England. But eight years later Baldassarino got an opportunity for a far more elaborate undertaking. His *Balet Comique de la Royne* was devised for the wedding of the Queen's sister, Mlle de Vaudemont, to the Duc de Joyeuse on 15 October 1581.[5] His own share seems to have lain in the invention of the general scheme of the enter-

[1] Perhaps Jonson's persistent use of 'masque' for the older 'mask' confesses a sense of derivation in his mind.

[2] The data are collected by Prunières, 34.

[3] Brantôme (ed. Soc. H. F.), vii. 346; Prunières, 48 sqq.; Brotanek, 291.

[4] *Magnificentissimi spectaculi . . . in Henrici Regis Poloniae . . . gratulationem Descriptio Io Aurato Poeta Regio Autore* (1573); cf. Lacroix, i. xxi, and the engraving reproduced by Prunières as pl. 2. Prunières, 70, thinks that Baltasar had already taken part in the 'mascarade', half-tilt, half-dance, at the wedding of Henri of Navarre in 1572.

[5] *Balet comique de la Royne faict aux Nopces de Monsieur le Duc de Joyeuse et de Mademoyselle de Vaudemont, sa Sœur, par Baltasar de Beaujoyeulx, Valet de Chambre du Roy et de la Royne, sa Mere* (1582). This is reprinted, but without the engravings, by Lacroix, i. 1; cf. Prunières, 75, who gives one of the engravings as his pl. 3.

tainment and in the dances; he had the assistance of M. de la Chesnaye for the verses, Lambert de Beaulieu for the music, and Jacques Patin for the painting. The Queen herself led the dancers. There was an intricate combination of choreography and mythological setting. The maskers proper were twelve Naiads in white and four Dryads in green; the presenters Circe, a Fugitive from her garden, Glaucus, Thetis, Mercury, Pan, Minerva, Jupiter; the musicians mermaids, tritons, satyrs, virtues, and others; the torch-bearers twelve pages. At the top of the hall was a daïs for the royal seats, and to the right and left in front places for ambassadors. Behind, and also lower down the hall, were tiers of seats, and above them two galleries; in all 9,000 or 10,000 spectators were present. On the left of the hall was a Gilded Vault for musicians, on the right the Grove of Pan, and at the foot the Garden of Circe, both veiled by curtains. In the roof, between the Vault and the Grove, hung a cloud. On each side of the Garden, trellises covered the entrance. After a preliminary episode between Circe and the Fugitive, the Naiads appeared on a movable fountain, and danced twelve geometrical figures as the 'première entrée du ballet'. They were then enchanted by Circe, and taken to her garden, with Mercury, who dropped from the cloud in a vain attempt at rescue. After two 'intermèdes' of music and song, during which the Dryads entered and the Grove of Pan was disclosed, came Minerva on a chariot, and called Jupiter from the cloud and Pan from the Grove for an assault on the Garden. Circe was captured, and her wand presented to the King. Then the Naiads and Dryads danced fifteen 'passages' as the 'entrée du grand ballet', and forty more of a geometrical character for the 'grand ballet' itself. Finally, they presented the King and gentlemen with 'choses de mer' and appropriate 'devises' or mottoes, and took them out for 'le grand bal' followed by 'bransles' and other dances.

So far as published documents go, the *Balet Comique* is closely the prototype of the fully developed 'ballet' or court mask, as we find it both in France and in England.[1] The Gray's Inn mask of 1595, with its printed description and its theme of enchantment, confesses an influence; and

[1] Prunières, 94 *sqq.* Lacroix, i. 89, 109, 237, 271, 305, prints four French masks which allow of a useful comparison with those of England, viz. *Ballet des Chevaliers François et Béarnois* (1592), *Balletz representez devant le Roy* (1593), *Ballet de Monseigneur le Duc de Vandosme* (1610); *Ballet du Courtisan et des Matrones* (1612); also a description of *Le Grand Bal de la Reine Marguerite* (1612), which shows the relation of the mask to the contemporary non-mimetic state ball. On French masks of 1605, 1609, 1612, and 1615, cf. Sullivan, 29, 52, 67, 99.

there were only two directions in which the devisers of Henri IV and of James I were able to make any notable advance upon Baldassarino's model. One of these was the introduction of the antimask, to which it will be necessary to return; the other was the concentration of the scenic setting. The setting of the *Balet Comique* is not concentrated but dispersed. It is not even all stationary. The interest of the spectators is not merely divided amongst the Garden of Circe at the foot of the hall, the Grove of Pan on the right, the musicians' vault on the left, and the cloud overhead. It is claimed at certain points by the movable fountain upon which the maskers enter and the chariot of Minerva. This dispersed setting recurs in the first of Queen Anne's great masks, Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, in 1604. A mountain stood at the lower end of the hall in Hampton Court, and at the upper end a Cave of Sleep on one side and a Temple of Peace on the other. A contemporary observer notes an inconvenience of this arrangement. 'The Halle was so much lessened by the workes that were in it', writes Dudley Carleton, 'so as none could be admitted but men of apparance.' This difficulty proved fatal to the dispersed setting, and in all later Jacobean masks the setting was concentrated in a scene erected at the lower end of the hall, and ample space was thus left both for the evolutions of the dancers and for the seating of the spectators.[1]

This change at least synchronizes with the emergence of Inigo Jones and the beginning of the architectural domination which for nearly half a century he was destined to exercise over the mask. His is the first outstanding name which we can associate with the history of English scenic decoration. Under Elizabeth and her predecessors the apparel and pageantry of a mask were the care of the Revels officers, and they naturally called in such painters and other men of taste about the court as were likely to prove useful. These were often foreigners. Alfonso Ferrabosco, the musician, seems to have had the general oversight of an important mask in 1572, and amongst his collaborators was another Italian, Petruccio Ubaldini, while Hans Eottes drew the patterns. Eottes was similarly employed in 1573 and 1574, and Ubaldini was called upon again in 1579 to write out the speeches of a mask in his native Italian.[2] The responsibilities

[1] Exceptionally, the main scene was supplemented by a throne 'in midst of the hall' in the *Mask of Beauty* and by a mount and tree at the upper end of the hall in *Tethys' Festival*.

[2] On Hans Eottes, or Eworth, first traceable as Jon Eeuwowts of Antwerp in 1540, and the considerable body of portrait work now ascribed

of Inigo Jones were much wider than those of any of these predecessors. His singular name has an Italian ring, but he was born of London parentage in 1573 and is said to have been apprenticed to a joiner.[1] Through the generosity of the third Earl of Pembroke he had opportunities of travel, and spent much of his early life in Italy and in the service of Christian IV of Denmark. He seems to have been back in England by 28 June 1603, when the accounts of the Earl of Rutland record a payment of £10 to 'Henygo Jones, a picture maker'. He is not known to have taken part in the masks of the following winter, but Jonson acknowledges that 'the bodily part' of the *Mask of Blackness* on 6 January 1605 was his 'design and act', and in August of the same year he took charge of the plays given before James in the hall of Christ Church, Oxford, and contrived their changes of scene with the aid of revolving triangular screens of Italian design. His place as an architect of court masks was now assured, and even the poets, to whom the descriptions of the performances naturally fell, found it impossible to conceal the fact that his functions were at least as important as their own. Jonson in his earlier descriptions is punctilious in rendering due credit to his colleague.[2] So too are Daniel and Campion.[3]

to him, cf. L. Cust, *The Painter* Æ (*Annual of Walpole Soc.* ii. 1; iii. 113). On Ferrabosco and Ubaldini, ch. xiv (Italians).

[1] For the career of Jones, cf. *D. N. B.*, Reyher, 75; R. Blomfield in *Portfolio* (1889), 88, 113, 126; and *Renaissance Architecture in England*, i. 97; H. P. Horne, *An Essay on the Life of Inigo Jones, Architect* in *The Hobby Horse* (1893), 22, 64; P. Cunningham, *Inigo Jones* (1848). Designs by Jones for the scenery, stage-machinery, and dresses of masks and other court entertainments are in *Lansdowne MS.* 1171, and in the collections of the Duke of Devonshire at Chatsworth and of the Royal Institute of British Architects. They are mostly of the Caroline rather than the Jacobean period. A few have been reproduced by Cunningham, Reyher, and Lawrence, ii. 97. P. Simpson (*Sh. England*, ii. 311) gives eight figures for the *Mask of Queens*.

[2] 'The design and act of all which, together with the device of their habits, belong properly to the merit and reputation of Master Inigo Jones, whom I take modest occasion in this fit place to remember, lest his own worth might accuse me of an ignorant neglect from my silence' (*Hymenaei*); 'The structure and ornament . . . was entirely Master Jones's invention and design. . . . All which I willingly acknowledge for him; since it is a virtue planted in good natures, that what respects they wish to obtain fruitfully from others they will give ingenuously themselves' (*Queens*).

[3] 'The artificiall part ouely speakes Master Inago Jones' (*Tethys' Festival*); 'I suppose few have ever seen more neat artifice than Master Inigo Jones shewed in contriving their motion, who in all the rest of the workmanship which belonged to the whole invention shewed extraordinary industry and skill, which if it be not as lively exprest in writing as it appeared in view, rob not him of his due, but lay the blame on my want of right apprehending his instructions for the adorning his art' (*Lords*).

It was not until Caroline days that the smouldering antagonism between Jonson and Jones broke out into open warfare, and stung Jonson to various indiscretions, amongst them the ironical outburst of the famous *Expostulation*—

Painting and carpentry are the soul of masque![1]

Of thirteen spectacular masks given at court from 1605 to 1613 nine were certainly contrived by Jones, and there is no positive evidence that the other four were not his.[2] He had also a share in the preparations for Prince Henry's barriers of 1610. When the prince set up his household in the following December Jones was appointed surveyor of his works. After Henry's death he obtained a reversion of a similar appointment in the royal Office of Works, but this reversion did not fall in until the death of Simon Basil on 1 October 1615, and after the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth in 1613 Jones paid a visit of some duration to Italy. He therefore took no part in the masks for the Somerset wedding during the following winter. For one at least of these, Campion's *Mask of Squires*, his substitute was Constantine de' Servi, a Florentine who had also been in the service of Henry as his architect; but Campion was not pleased with his coadjutor, and wrote that 'he being too much of himself, and no way to be drawn to impart his intentions, failed so far in the assurance he gave that the main invention, even at the last cast, was of force drawn into a far narrower compass than was from the beginning intended'. Jones was back in England by 29 January 1615, and was to plan many more masks before his death in 1652. But none can be definitely ascribed to him before Jonson's *Mask of Christmas* in 1617. During the latter part of his career he was busy as an architect, and the present banqueting-house in Whitehall, built during 1619–22, represents a fragment of one of his grandiose schemes for the complete reconstruction of the old palace.

The concentrated setting, as it took shape in the first period

[1] Cunningham, *Jonson*, iii. 211.

[2] *Mask of Blackness* (1605); *Hymenaei* (1606); *Haddington Mask* (1608); *Mask of Queens* (1609); *Tethys' Festival* (1610); *Oberon* (1611); *Love Freed from Ignorance and Folly* (1611); *Lords' Mask* (1613); *Chapman's Mask* (1613). The designers of the *Hay Mask* (1607), *Beaumont's Mask* (1613), and the *Mask of the Twelve Months* are not named. Jonson says that the scene of the *Mask of Beauty* (1608) was 'put in act' by the King's Master Carpenter. This was an officer of the Works, one William Portington (Jupp, *Carpenters' Company*, 165). He was not necessarily the designer, but Jonson does not, as one would expect, mention Jones. *Love Restored* (1612) had a chariot, but perhaps no scene. The *Irish Mask* (1613) seems to be a Jacobean example of the simple mask. The *Caversham Mask* (1613) is another, but this was not at court.

of Inigo Jones, appears to have been regularly designed on the principle of what is sometimes called the ' picture-stage '.[1] It was framed by a proscenium arch, from side to side of which stretched, at first view, a curtain. This arch was of a familiar Renaissance type. On either side were pilasters, or statuesquely modelled figures, or a combination of the two, which bore up a frieze. The decorations were in harmony with the theme of the mask and the frieze might contain a scroll or panel setting forth its title.[2] It cannot perhaps be demonstrated that Jones invariably used a proscenium from the beginning, but at any rate by 1608 (*Haddington Mask*) ' the arch ' appears to have been a recognized element of a setting. The most elaborate description of a proscenium is that written by Jones himself for *Tethys' Festival* in 1610. On this occasion the proscenium was itself covered by a curtain until the audience were seated. It is possible, however, that it sometimes framed a front curtain. The use of curtains was, of course, no innovation. They had served, when concealment and revelation were required, both in the mobile and in the fixed settings of earlier days. Thus for an Elizabethan mask of 1565, of which the pageant was ' a rock or hill for the ix musses to singe vppone ', the Revels Office had provided ' a vayne of sarsnett drawen vpp and downe before them '.[3] The Jacobean curtain itself might form part of the setting. It was painted to represent a wooded ' landtschap ' (*Blackness*), clouds (*Hay Mask*, *Tethys' Festival*), night (*Beauty*), a red cliff (*Haddington Mask*), a city wall and gate (*Flowers*). But at an early moment it was removed, to ' discover ' a more solidly constructed scene within. Often it is called a ' traverse ', and when it is ' drawne ' it may either ' slide away ', or ' sink down ' (*Marston's Mask*).[4] I have not come across a certain case in which it was drawn up, either directly by a roller, or diagonally by cords towards the corners of the proscenium; but these methods may also have been employed. In some masks the drawing of the curtain ' discovered ' the maskers on the scene; in others their entry was deferred and variously contrived. The maskers, and sometimes the presenters, had, before the

[1] A far more thorough treatment than is possible for me will be found in the chapter on *La Mise en Scène*, in Reyher, 332.

[2] Designs by Jones for *proscenia* (of Caroline date) are reproduced by Lawrence (i. 97), *The Mounting of the Carolan Masques*; on proscenium titles, cf. Lawrence, i. 46.

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 117; cf. Halle, ii. 87.

[4] An ingenious paper on *The Story of a Peculiar Stage Curtain* in Lawrence, 109, suggests an affiliation between this sinking curtain and the Roman *aulaeum*.

actual dances began, to come forward through the proscenium arch to the dancing place, which was on the floor of the hall, or on a stage only slightly raised above it, and was regularly laid with green cloth by the official ' mattleyer ' of the court.[1] This advance was managed in divers ways. The old device of a movable pageant might be revived, as an element subsidiary to the fixed scene, and the maskers brought in on a chariot (*Queens*, *Oberon*), or enthroned on a floating isle (*Beauty*). They might be let down by a cloud from the upper part of the scene (*Hymenaei*, *Lords' Mask*). For the *Mask of Blackness* Jones made an artificial sea on a wheeled stage, which lifted them forwards in a concave shell. It was quite effective as a spectacle, if they stepped in their bravery down a slope (*Hay Mask*) or a double stairway (*Chapman's Mask*, *Squires*) leading from the scene to the lower level of the dancing place.

The adoption of the concentrated setting was a matter of convenience ; it did not mean that the mask could dispense with the variety of interest which the multiplied scenes of the dispersed setting had afforded. Jones's chief problem as a producer was that of securing this variety of interest under new conditions, and if possible with some added sensation of curiosity or surprise. One device was to retain the multiplied scenes, and to juxtapose them, or to superimpose one upon another within the frame of the proscenium. It was easy enough to divide the curtain either vertically or horizontally and to ' draw ' the sections separately. Thus in the *Hymenaei*, which was a double mask, the altar of Hymen and the globe containing the men maskers were first discovered below. Subsequently the ' upper part of the scene ' opened, and the women maskers floated out on *nimbi*. In *Lord Hay's Mask* there was a ' double veil ' of which the lesser part covered a Bower of Flora on the right of the stage, and the greater part covered a House of Night on the left, and a grove and hill crowned by a Tree of Diana in the centre. This method paid homage to the tradition of the dispersed setting ; another, which could be used in combination with the first, was capable of more intricate development. The manœuvre of the front curtain might be repeated. The whole, or a fragment, of the inner scene might be shifted, so as to discover a new vision which had at first been concealed. Often this was only a local and particular transformation. Thus it was in the two masks just cited, when the globe behind the altar of Hymen revolved and showed the maskers

[1] *Chamber Accounts* ; cf. Reyher, 358.

seated in a cave, or the trees in the grove of Diana were drawn into the ground, and the maskers appeared out of their cloven tops. Similarly the splitting of a rock, to let out personages concealed therein, is an incident which recurs in more than one mask (*Haddington Mask, Oberon, Chapman's Mask*). The development of the antimask, with the emphatic contrast between the grotesque and the magnificent which this implied, seems to have been the motive which led to the introduction of more wholesale changes of scene. In the *Mask of Queens* the background for the antimask was a Hell, and when it was over 'the whole face of the scene altered, scarce suffering the memory of such a thing', and in place of the Hell appeared a House of Fame. In *Mercury Vindicated*, again, the Laboratory of the antimasks gave way to a Bower of Nature for the mask proper. In *Oberon* the antimask was before a cliff with a rising moon, and thereafter the scene twice opened, to disclose, first the 'frontispiece' and then the interior of a palace of Fays. The art of transformation was perhaps carried to its greatest extent during this period in the *Lords' Mask* for the Princess Elizabeth's wedding, of which the Venetian ambassador in his report to the Signory especially noted the three changes of scene as an outstanding feature. This elaborate spectacle affords examples of nearly all the devices of juxtaposition, superimposition, partial and complete transformation, by which a variety of scenic interest is reconciled with a concentrated setting. The original scene was horizontally divided. The lower half, which was first discovered, contained side by side a wood, a thicket of Orpheus, and a cave of Mania. Before this danced the antimask. Then a curtain fell from the upper part of the scene, and discovered amongst clouds Prometheus and eight Stars. The Stars were individually transformed to men maskers, and the clouds to the House of Prometheus. Beneath torch-bearers emerged and danced, still in front of the wood. The whole face of the scene was then overspread with a cloud on which the men maskers descended. The lower part of the scene was then changed from a wood to a façade of niches containing statues, which were individually transformed into women maskers. The mask proper followed, and when the dancing was over, there was a final change of the whole scene to a porticoed perspective, leading up to the obelisk of Sibylla. Even by 1613 the art of Jones had handsomely accomplished its task of ministering to the pride of the eyes. In his later or Caroline period he advanced to even greater triumphs, and did not shrink from the decorative and mechanical difficulties

entailed by as many as five changes of scene.[1] The actual mechanism employed by Jones to obtain his effects is perhaps better known to us for this later period, in view of the numerous plans and designs preserved at Chatsworth and elsewhere, than for the earlier one. The action of a mask was in all cases 'continuous', and therefore he was happily debarred from the awkward modern convention of a drop-curtain. Jones ultimately worked out a system of back-cloths and shutters or flats, arranged and painted so as to produce a perspective and an illusion of solid scenery. These ran in horizontal grooves, so that those belonging to one scene could be placed close behind those belonging to another, and each set could be successively removed by lateral withdrawal. It was, in fact, a multiplied use of the primitive 'traverse' or sliding curtain. This system may have already been at his disposal in the Jacobean period; it was well adapted, in particular, for the splitting of a rock. But it is clear that he also used a device based upon a different principle, a *machina versatilis*, which by means of a circular motion was capable of displaying successively the different faces of a comparatively solid decorative structure placed upon it. Jonson applies the term *machina versatilis* to the House of Fame in the *Mask of Queens*. Presumably the rotating globe in *Hymenaei* and the rotating throne of Beauty in the *Mask of Beauty* are other examples; and yet another is furnished by *Tethys' Festival*, where however the *truc* was used, not to carry scenery, but to cover a change of scene by directing the attention of the spectators to three whirling circles of lights and glasses. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon such subsidiary devices as the trap-doors in the floor of the stage, or the pulleys by which floating clouds were let down from the heavens, for such obvious and primitive machinery had been familiar, long before the advent of Jones, as an element in the rudimentary technique of the popular theatre.[2]

The approximation of mask to drama entailed by the adoption of the concentrated setting was not the only point of interaction between these parallel forms of *mimesis*. In the first instance it was perhaps the drama, rather than the mask, which underwent an influence. The various forms of spectacular entertainment with which the mask became entangled during the fifteenth century might be introduced at more than one moment in the long story of a Renaissance festival. They were equally well adapted to enliven the

[1] Reyher, 367.

[2] Cf. ch. xx.

intervals between the courses of a meal, and the intervals between the parts of an organized dramatic performance. The detached character of the Senecan chorus, and the Roman practice of dividing up tragedies and comedies into acts, which was itself a departure from the Greek principle of continuous action, facilitated this intrusive development; and in the history of the Italian stage, as it shaped itself at Ferrara and elsewhere from 1486 until the middle of the next century, nothing is more remarkable than the tendency to bury the actual play, tragedy or comedy, classical or modern, in a wilderness of decorative *intermedii*, ordinarily consisting of dances and song, framed in some ingenuity of allegorical, mythological, or other device.[1] It is, I think, a true affiliation which traces to the *intermedii* the analogous dumb-shows of English usage.[2] These belong primarily to the learned court drama, with its admitted classical and Italian inspiration. To some extent they found their way also on to the popular stage, which had, moreover, its own simpler devices for the avoidance of monotony in the way of 'jigs' and 'themes'.[3] But the influence of the dumb-show upon the drama is not wholly to be measured by the extent to which it was adopted as a formal element in the structure of plays. It introduced a spectacular tendency, which continued to prevail long after the position of the dumb-show as an interact had been surrendered. Indeed, the extreme Italian development of the *intermedii* constituted a danger against which the lovers of a purer dramatic art were soon in protest.[4] If tragedy and comedy had not succeeded in absorbing spectacle, they would have been overwhelmed by it. The first battle was won when it was admitted that the subjects of the *intermedii* ought to be related to the theme of the drama, which was by no means always the case at Ferrara; the second when the spectacle was taken out of the intervals between the acts and treated as an integral part of the action. This is the normal, although not of course the invariable, Elizabethan practice. Elizabethan drama is abundantly spectacular, and often enough the spectacle is irrelevant or excessive, but as a rule it is, formally at least, within the plot. There are the drums and tramplings of battles and trials and funerals. There are the divine epiphanies in mythological pieces. There are the endless opportunities afforded

[1] Cf. ch. xix.

[2] Cunliffe, *The Influence of Italian on Early Elizabethan Drama* (*M. P.* iv. 597), and *Early English Classical Tragedies*, xl.

[3] F. A. Foster, *Dumb Show in Elizabethan Drama before 1620* (*E. S.* xliv. 8); cf. ch. xviii.

[4] Cunliffe, xxxi, xxxix.

for song and dance by banquets, weddings, and rustic merry-makings. And if all else fails, what more easy than to introduce a dumb-show in a dream or as a specimen of the magician's art ? [1] A somewhat paradoxical type of incorporated spectacle is the play within the play, as we find it, for example, in *Hamlet*, where indeed the inner play has the further elaboration of its accompanying dumb-show.[2] And with the play within the play comes the mask within the play. In the *intermedii* the mask, as already suggested, tended to lose its individuality. There were dancers, no doubt, and the dancers were disguised, and might be masked ; and there are signs of an extended use of the term ' mask ' to cover such an entertainment.[3] But the characteristic feature of the mask proper, the taking out of spectators to dances, did not lend itself to the conditions of performances given while the spectators sat at meat, or of performances on the raised and isolated stage of an interlude. When a mask proper was closely associated with an early Tudor play, it was as an after-piece rather than as an inter-act. The dancers of the *intermedii* kept to themselves, and if the sexes intermingled it was in a ' double ' choir. But when the spectacles became episodes, instead of *intermedii*, the central incident of the mask could be restored. Dancers who were personages of a play could obviously ' take out ' spectators who were also personages of the same play ; and the introduction of a mask, generally as a revel in a royal feast or wedding banquet, becomes a regular dramatic device at least from the last decade of the sixteenth century onwards. Perhaps the first example is in an academic play, Gager's *Ulysses Redux* of 1592, where at the beginning of Act II ' Proci larvati alicunde prodeunt, saltantque in scena ', and as we learn from the criticism of Rainolds, some of Penelope's handmaids, seated amongst the audience, were ' entreated by the wooers to rise

[1] For the spectacle as dream, cf. *Henry VIII*, iv. 2 ; *Cymbeline*, v. 4, which, like the epiphany in *A. Y. L.* v. 4, perhaps illustrates the point all the better in that it is probably an interpolation ; for the spectacle as magic show, Marlowe, *Dr. Faustus*, 515, 721, 1263 ; *Macbeth*, iv. 1 ; *Tempest*, iii. 3, and the mock magic of *Merry Wives*, v. 5. The mask of *Tempest*, iv. 1, is of course both mask and magic.

[2] *Hamlet*, iii. 2. 146. On the play within a play, cf. H. Schwab, *Das Schauspiel im Schauspiel zur Zeit Shaksperes* (1896).

[3] In *Spanish Tragedy*, i. 5, Hieronimo brings in a ' pompous jest ' in which three knights hang up their scutcheons and capture three kings. This is called a ' mask ' (l. 23), but there is no dance, only a dumb-show interpreted by Hieronimo. Similarly the ' Maske of Cupid ' in Spenser, *F. Q.* III. xii, is merely an allegorical procession, without a dance. Later, Dekker and Ford's play of *The Sun's Darling* (1656) is described on the title-page as ' a moral masque '.

and danse upon the stage '.[1] Shakespeare has a mask in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and another in *Romeo and Juliet*, to which the episode is handed down from the ultimate source in Italian narrative.[2] Another early example is in *1 Richard II* (iv. 2). Munday has a mask in his *Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* (*1598*; ii. 2), Dekker (ii. 204) in his *Whore of Babylon* (*c. 1607*) and his *Satiromastix* (*1601*; l. 2302), and Tourneur, if it was Tourneur, in his *Revenger's Tragedy* (*c. 1607*; v. 3). These are examples from the public theatres. When the boys' companies came into existence at the end of the century, dance and song proved well within their means; and their principal writers, Marston, Chapman, Middleton, Field, Jonson, all make use of the mask.[3] So do Beaumont and Fletcher, both in plays for boys and in plays for men.[4] But the enumeration of earlier names is of itself enough to dispose of the theory that to Beaumont and Fletcher is due, in some special way, the transference of the court mask to the popular stage, and in particular the introduction of Shakespeare to the supposed new idea. Doubtless the mask in *A Maid's Tragedy* is set out with somewhat greater elaboration of presentment than was usual in earlier plays, and doubtless the antimask of Beaumont's contribution to the Princess Elizabeth's wedding was furbished up again for the delight of a popular audience in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. But it hardly follows that Shakespeare, after using the mask in *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet*, had anything to learn from his younger rivals before he used it in *The Tempest*, and a writer who can assert that Ben Jonson 'did not mix his masques and plays' must have simply forgotten *Cynthia's Revels*.[5] The mask in this play is of

[1] Cf. Boas, 206.

[2] *L. L. L.* v. 2; *R. J.* i. 4, 5. Similarly the mask in *Hen. VIII*, i. 4, is suggested by the historic source. In *M. V.* ii. 5, 28, Shylock warns Jessica against masks in the street, with their drum and 'wry-necked fife', but none is shown.

[3] Marston, *1 Antonio and Mellida* (*1599*; v. 1), *2 Antonio and Mellida* (*1599*; v. 1, 2), *Dutch Courtesan* (*1603*; iv. 1), *Malcontent* (*1604*; v. 2, 3), *Insatiate Countess* (*c. 1610*; ii. 1); Chapman, *May Day* (*1602*; v. 1), *Widow's Tears* (*1605*; iii. 2), *Byron's Tragedy* (*1608*; ii. 1); Middleton, *The Old Law* (a mask in a tavern, *1599*; iv. 1), *Blurt Master Constable* (*c. 1600*; ii. 2), *A Mad World, my Masters* (*c. 1604–6*; ii. 2, 4, 5), *Your Five Gallants* (*1607*; iv. 8; v. 1, 2), *No Wit, no Help, like a Woman's* (*c. 1613*; iv. 2); Field, *A Woman is a Weathercock* (*c. 1609*; v. 1, 2); Jonson, *Cynthia's Revels* (*1601*; iv. 5, 6; v. 1–5).

[4] *The Coxcomb* (*1610*; i. 1), *Maid's Tragedy* (*1611*; i. 1, 2), *Four Plays in One* (*1612*; i. v), *Two Noble Kinsmen* (not strictly a mask, *1613*; iii. 5), *Henry VIII* (*1613*; i. 4), *Wit at Several Weapons* (*1614*; v. 1).

[5] A. H. Thorndike, *The Influence of the Court-Masques on the Drama*

special interest, because it is Elizabethan and antedates by some four years the first of the long series of Jonson's Jacobean masks. It occupies, in the quarto version, the greater part of the last seven scenes of the play. In iv. 5 Arete, a principal lady at court, desires revels for Cynthia, and Amorphus proposes a 'masque'. Arete undertakes to send for Criticus, and get his advice.[1] In iv. 6 Criticus hesitates to write for such revellers as Amorphus and his crew. Arete encourages him. The presence will restrain them when they are masked, and Cynthia needs the opportunity to reform them. Criticus then invokes Apollo and Mercury. In v. 1 Cynthia, awaiting the mask, holds flattering discourse with Arete on its author. In v. 2 enters 'the first masque'. Cupid 'disguised like Anteros', presents four virgins from the palace of Perfection, Storge, Aglaia, Euphantaste, and Apheleia. He interprets their devices, and presents on their behalf a crystal, in which Cynthia sees her own image. In v. 3 Cynthia discusses the mask with Criticus and Arete. In v. 4 enters 'the second masque'. Mercury presents and interprets the four sons of Eutaxia, who are Eucosmos, Eupathes, Eutolmos, and Eucolos. In iv. 5 'the masques joyne'. They dance the first, second, and third 'straine', while Cupid and Mercury converse, outside the *cadre* of the mask. The dancers do not proceed to 'take out' spectators, but that is presumably because they are interrupted by Cynthia, who bids them unmask and administers her reproof.

The masks inserted in plays are rarely described with anything like the fullness of *Cynthia's Revels*, although there is a fair amount of detail in *The Maid's Tragedy* and a somewhat less amount in *Your Five Gallants* and in *No Wit, no Help, like a Woman's*. It must be borne in mind that the main action of a mask was mute, and that the stage directions of the printed texts are not intended to be descriptive. Moreover, the structural place of the mask in a plot often leads, as in *Cynthia's Revels*, to its abrupt termination. The disguises cover an intrigue of murder (*2 Antonio and Mellida*, *Revenger's Tragedy*) or of robbery (*A Mad World, my Masters*), or of elopement (*A Woman is a Weathercock*). Or a quarrel breaks out (*Dutch Courtesan*), or a masker is discovered to be dead (*Satiromastix*). As a rule, too, the presenters' speeches

(*M. L. A.* xv. 114); *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 130, 148.

[1] I think Criticus must here be taken to be Jonson's self-portrait. He told Drummond in 1619 that 'by Criticus is understood Done' (*Conversations*, 6); but the reference there appears to be to the lost 'preface of his *Arte of Poesie*'. In the folio text of the play Criticus becomes Crites.

are omitted or cut short, since it is spectacle, and not mere dialogue, that is required.[1] Nevertheless, in its main features, the dramatized mask confirms what we know of the mask from other sources. It has its dancers, its presenters, its torch-bearers, and its music.[2] *Your Five Gallants* adds 'shield boys' to carry the 'devices'. When the performers have finished their measures, they generally take out the ladies. At the end they unmask, 'honour' the guests (*A Women is a Weathercock*), and depart, or proceed to a banquet. And in some interesting points the dramatized mask supplements other information. To begin with, it is a simpler type of mask than is represented by the full Jacobean descriptions. For obvious reasons architectural pageantry could hardly be introduced. In *The Maid's Tragedy* there is a rock, in *Satiromastix* a chair; in *May Day* Cupid 'descends', a feat, as already noted, well within the compass of an ordinary theatre. And that is about all. You get the mask as it was practised at Elizabeth's court, rather than at that of James. Then there are sometimes subsidiary scenes, which throw light upon aspects of the mask, not much dwelt on in the Jacobean descriptions. Often there is a scene of preparation, when the 'maskery' is planned, and a 'device', 'imprezza', or 'mott' ordered of the painter, or 'a few tinsel coats' of the vizard-maker (*1 Antonio and Mellida*, *Insatiate Countess*, *A Mad World, my Masters*, *Your Five Gallants*, *A Woman is a Weathercock*). Or there is a scene of bustle, when a 'state' and canopy are set up in the 'presence' (*Satiromastix*) and room is made for the dancers, either by the cry of 'A hall, a hall!' (*Romeo and Juliet*, *May Day*) or by the more violent ministrations of the torch-bearers (*A Woman is a Weathercock*) or of court officials. Thus in *The Maid's Tragedy* the mask is preluded by the activities of Calianax, the lord chamberlain, who 'would run raging among them, and break a dozen wiser heads than his own in the twinkling of an eye', and of Diagoras the gentleman usher, who is keeping the doors against the impatient crowd without, and placing the ladies, all except those who come in 'the king's troop', in a gallery 'above'. There

[1] The maskers in *Wit at Several Weapons*, v. i, are 'something like the abstract of a masque'; cf. *R. J.* i. 4. 3—

> The date is out of such prolixity.
> We'll have no Cupid hoodwink'd with a scarf,
> Bearing a Tartar's painted bow of lath,
> Scaring the ladies like a crow-keeper;
> Nor no without-book prologue, faintly spoke
> After the prompter, for our entrance.

[2] *Satiromastix*, 2325, 'The watch-word in a maske is the bolde drum'.

is a similar scene in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Four Plays in One*, a piece which consists of three short playlets, divided by 'triumphs' or *intermedii*, and concluded by a mask. This may be regarded as an experiment, in which the influence of the mask-tradition has exceptionally modified the typical structure of the drama. Nor does it stand quite alone. Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* is of course spectacular throughout, and the last scene, in which the golden apple is handed to Elizabeth, is clearly, in its recognition of the audience, a divergence from the normal detachment of the drama.[1] Perhaps the same may be said of the epithalamic end of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, but as a rule the element of mask remains an episode, and does not dominate the play which admits it.

The debt of the mask to the play may be traced in the increased skill in which the later masks are arranged around a 'device' or dramatic idea. The mask had had its presenters as far back as Lydgate. Even in a learned court, the more recondite forms of allegory or mythology sometimes require explanation. The maskers proper seem to have been traditionally mum and therefore unable to explain themselves. Let us remember that they were not professional actors, but English men and women of good birth and breeding, and that therefore their limbs could more easily be trained than their wits and voices. If explanation was required, it must be given in an introductory speech by a subsidiary performer. Such a spokesman seems to have been known to the Elizabethan Revels as a 'truchman' or interpreter.[2] In addition to his function of elucidation he became the natural vehicle of whatever compliment was to be paid by the mask, and when Arthur Throgmorton wished to turn the heart of

[1] I do not wish to exaggerate this detachment. Peele builds upon the customary prayer for the queen or lord at the end of an interlude (cf. chh. x, xviii, xxii), and there are the plays with inductions, such as *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, in which the personages of the induction mediate between the action and the audience.

[2] I find 'tronchwoman' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 217), 'troocheman' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 287), 'trounchman' (Gascoigne, i. 85), and as interpreters of mimetic tilts 'crocheman' (Halle, i. 13), 'trounchman' (Peele, *Polyhymnia*, 47); also 'an interpreter or a truchman' accompanying the 'orator speaking a straunge language' in the train of the Lord of Misrule in 1552–3 (Feuillerat, *Edw. and M.* 89, 123). W. D. Macray has the following note to 'truckman' which appears in the text of Clarendon, *History*, i. 75, 'i. e. *truchman = dragoman*. In the old editions the word "interpreter" was substituted as an explanation; in the last editions "trustman" was given as the reading of the MS.'. *N. E. D.* gives the earliest use of the word as 1485 and derives through Med. Lat. *turchemannus* from Arab. *turjamān*, interpreter, whence also *dragoman*.

Elizabeth in 1595, we find him undertaking the part himself. The Elizabethan truchmen do not seem to have got much beyond formal speeches, and the child dressed as Mercury or Cupid became rather *banal* through much repetition. If anything more dramatic was attempted, either through the presenters, or by dividing the dancers into a double mask, it was apt to be based upon the mediaeval idea of an assault. In the device for the abortive masks of 1562 the presenters were to do most of the fighting. In 1559, on the other hand, it was successive bands of maskers that rifled and rescued the Queen's maids. How far the mask of Diana and Actaeon in the following winter took a dramatic form we do not know. The development of the mask on dramatic lines seems to have been a slow business. Even Jonson, in *Cynthia's Revels*, has not got beyond Cupid and Mercury and the formal speeches. On the other hand, the Gray's Inn mask, which preceded *Cynthia's Revels* by some years, and nearly all the Jacobean masks, especially Jonson's, show a marked progress in this respect. A dramatic idea is nearly always dominant, and there is ingenuity in grouping the fixed elements of the mask about it. A comparison between Gascoigne's treatment of a wedding mask in 1572 and Jonson's in 1608 may serve to illustrate this. Gascoigne's maskers are Montagues of Italy, who have been driven by a storm to the shores of England, and take the opportunity to visit their English kinsmen, in whose house the wedding happens to be taking place. The idea is not without point, but it is all expounded in a single and inevitably tedious speech by the truchman, during which the dancers must remain motionless. When Jonson has to celebrate the wedding of James Ramsay and Elizabeth Radcliffe in 1608 he proceeds very differently. Even the curtain introduces the hymeneal theme with its graceful symbolism of a red cliff. From the top of this Venus descends with her Graces. She is in search of her son, and bids the Graces ask whether he is concealed in the eyes or between the swelling breasts of the ladies in the audience. The Graces sing their appeal for the discovery of 'Venus' runaway'. Cupid now emerges, with a train of Joci and Risus, each bearing two torches, who dance a dance of triumph. Venus captures Cupid, and demands the cause of his jubilation. He slips away, but the explanation is given by Hymen, in a speech of flattery to the King on the 'state', to the bridegroom who saved the King's life, and to the maid of the Red Cliff, who is the bride. Hymen is followed by Vulcan, who splits the cliff, and discloses a concave fashioned by his art, in which sit the maskers. They are the twelve Signs of

the Zodiac, to each of whom is assigned some influence upon marriage. They advance and dance their measures, while Vulcan's attendants, the Cyclopes, Brontes and Steropes, beat time with their sledges, and in the pauses of the dancing the musicians, dressed as priests of Hymen, sing the verses of an epithalamion. How neatly it is all done! The maskers, the presenters, the torch-bearers, the musicians, all have their place in the scheme, and contribute towards the complimenting of the bridal pair.

It would perhaps be difficult to say how far the approximation to drama in the Jacobean masks was due to the subconscious mental processes of mask poets who were themselves playwrights, and how far to a deliberate intention to combine two arts.[1] As a rule it is safe to credit Jonson, at least, with fully conscious artistry. And here too the model set by Baldassarino's *Balet Comique* must not be neglected. The printed description of this contains a preface, in which Baldassarino justifies his use of the term 'comique' on the ground that he has arranged his 'balet' in acts and scenes like a comedy, and claims to be an innovator in this interweaving of poetry with the dance, to which 'le premier tiltre et honneur' are still left. The Jacobean poets did not essay a treatment by acts and scenes, which indeed has no great significance even in the *Balet Comique*. But Baldas-

[1] Generally speaking, the themes of the Jacobean masks are more literary than those of their Elizabethan precursors. The following analysis is based upon the disguises of the maskers, which may be classed under four main heads: *National Types*—(Elizabethan), Moors, Swart Rutters, Lance-Knights, Hungarians, Barbarians, Venetian Patriarchs, Italian Women, Venetians, Turks; (Jacobean), Indian and Chinese Knights, Virginians, Irishmen. *Occupations*—(Elizabethan), Ecclesiastics, Fisherwives, Marketwives, Astronomers, Shipmen, Country Maids, Clowns, Hunters, Tilters, Fishermen and Fruitwives, Mariners, Foresters, Warriors, Pedlars, Seamen; (Jacobean), none. *Inanimate Objects*—(Elizabethan), none; (Jacobean), Signs of Zodiac, Stars and Statues, Flowers. *Abstractions*—(Elizabethan), Nusquams, Virtues, Passions; (Jacobean), Humours and Affections, Ornaments of Court, Months. *Historical and Mythical Personages*—(Elizabethan), Conquerors, Huntsmen of Actaeon and Nymphs of Diana, Wise and Foolish Virgins, Satyrs, Greek Goddesses, Janus, Sages, Wild Men, Amazons and Knights, Knights of Purpulia, Muses; (Jacobean), Goddesses, Daughters of Niger (*bis*), Powers of Juno, Knights of Apollo, Sons of Mercury, Nymphs of English Rivers, Knights of Oberon, Daughters of Morn, Knights of Olympia, Disenchanted Knights, Sons of Nature, Circe's Lovers, Sons of Phoebus. It is possible that the mediaeval *barbatoriae* (*Mediaeval Stage*, i. 362) were dances representing national types. Jean d'Auton (*Chroniques*, ii. 99) describes, amongst other *mommeries* at the court of Louis XII in 1501, 'une danse en barboire, en laquelle fut dancé à la mode de France, d'Allemaigne, d'Espaigne et Lombardye, et à la fin en la manière de Poictou . . . lesquelz estoyent tous habillez à la sorte du pays dont ils dancerent à la mode'.

sarino's main idea, of the inhibition of the dance by the magic of Circe until the gods come to the rescue, may fairly be regarded as responsible for the several episodes of disenchantment or transformation which recur in the work of his successors.[1]

Jonson's mask for the Ramsay-Radcliffe wedding in 1608 represents a stage of importance in the evolution of the dramatic form. The entry of the maskers is preluded by a dance of the torch-bearing Joci and Risus. In describing his *Mask of Queens* of the following year, Jonson says, 'And because her majesty (best knowing that a principal part of life in these spectacles lay in their variety) had commanded me to think on some dance, or shew, that might precede hers, and have the place of a foil, or false masque, I was careful to decline, not only from others, but mine own steps in that kind, since the last year, I had an antimasque of boys; and therefore now devised that twelve women, in the habit of hags or witches, sustaining the persons of Ignorance, Suspicion, Credulity, &c., the opposites to good Fame, should fill that part, not as a masque, but a spectacle of strangeness, producing multiplicity of gesture, and not unaptly sorting with the current and whole fall of the device'. I am not quite sure what Jonson intends by the distinction here drawn between a 'masque' and a 'spectacle', for in fact the Hags dance 'a magical dance full of preposterous change and gesticulation', which is interrupted by a burst of loud music and an alteration in the face of the scene, heralding the introduction of the Queens in the House of Fame. However this may be, Jonson's innovation, with its obvious advantages of added variety, must have been immediately successful, for in practically all subsequent examples of the period the antimask appears as a fixed element in the scheme, preceding and setting off what Beaumont calls the 'maine' mask, and usually divided from it by a change of scene.[2] There are some slight further elaborations to record. In *Oberon*, in the *Lords' Mask*, and in *Chapman's Mask*, the antimask is followed by a dance of torch-bearers, to which also Chapman gives the name of 'antimask'. *Beaumont's Mask*, the *Mask of Squires*, *Mercury Vindicated*, and *Browne's Mask* have each two regular

[1] *Gesta Grayorum*; *Hay Mask*; *Lords' Mask*; *Mask of Squires*; *Mask of Flowers*; *Browne's Mask* (introducing Circe). As late as 1632 Aurelian Townshend and Inigo Jones borrow the episode of Circe and the Fugitive in *Tempe Restored*.

[2] An exception is *Love Restored*, where the place of an antimask is taken by the long comic induction by Masquerado, Plutus, and Robin Goodfellow.

antimasks, and in the *Mask of Squires* the second antimask is interpolated in the middle of the dances of the main mask. There is only one antimask in *The Twelve Months*, but two dances are assigned to it. The *Mask of Flowers* has, besides the antimask ' of dances ', a preliminary antimask ' of song '. The name ' antimask ' has given some trouble. Jonson's references to ' a foil, or false masque ' and to ' opposites ' suggest clearly enough that he used the prefix ' anti ' to indicate an antithesis or contrast. But in *Tethys' Festival* Daniel uses the form ' antemasque ', and this spelling, probably due to a misunderstanding by the worthy Daniel of the point of the innovation, recurs in *Chapman's Mask* and in *The Twelve Months*.[1] The *Mask of Flowers*, again, affords a third variation, in ' anticke-maske ', and this also, I think, *pace* Dr. Brotanek, must have its origin in a misunderstanding.[2] An ' antic ' dance is a grotesque dance, and this epithet is often applied to the personages of the antimasks and their evolutions, from the *Haddington Mask* onwards, since the characteristic antithesis which the antimask renders possible is precisely the antithesis between the grotesque prelude and the splendour of the main mask that follows.[3] I want to emphasize the point that this element of contrast introduced by the juxtaposition of mask and antimask is analogous to what critics have always regarded as a special feature of the Elizabethan, and particularly the Shakespearian drama, the juxtaposition of comedy and tragedy, either in the form of what is called tragicomedy, or by the inclusion of scenes of ' comic relief ' in tragedy proper. It is perhaps worth noting that in the French masks of 1610 and 1612 printed by Lacroix we find side by side with the ' grand ballet ' elements variously described as the ' première et plaisante entrée ' (1610) and ' la bouffonnerie ' (1612), which appear to serve just the same purpose as the English antimask.[4] But, of course, I do not mean to suggest that either in France or in England the grotesque made its way into the mask for the first time during the seventeenth century. The clowns, mariners, ' wodwoses ' and so forth of the earlier Elizabethan revels must have lent themselves to humorous treatment, and indeed mirth has at all times been of the essence of revels. There

[1] Chapman also uses the phrase ' mocke-maske ', which is analogous to Jonson's ' antimasque '.

[2] Brotanek, 141. I find ' antick Maske ' also in an Exchequer record (Reyher, 509) relating to the *Lords' Mask* of 1613.

[3] Cf. the opening stage-direction to *James IV* (1598), ' Enter after Oberon, King of Fayries, an Antique, who dance about a Tombe '.

[4] Lacroix, i. 241, 262, 291, 296.

is some reason to think that a traditional form of grotesque mask at court was the morris. This is of course a familiar type of folk-dance, and may owe its Tudor name to the *moresche*, which were dances introduced as *intermedii* into Italian plays.[1]

The spectacular and literary elaboration of the Jacobean mask must not be allowed to blind our eyes to the fact that after all it was not a dramatic illusion but a choregraphic compliment which remained the central purpose of the entertainment. Scenery and speech and song occupy perhaps a disproportionate share of the attention of the poets who, to their own glorification and that of the architects, wrote the descriptions; but the greater part of the considerable number of hours during which the mask lasted was devoted to the actual dancing. And the dancing involved an intimacy, and not a detachment, in the relation between performers and spectators. It is true that some of the traditional features which accompanied the mask, when court ceremonial first took it up from folk custom, tended under the new conditions to pass into the state of survivals. Thus the torch-bearers, whether or not their burning brands represent some original element of ritual in the folk festival, were certainly *de rigueur* as a concomitant of the mask during the sixteenth century. They had two clear functions. They provided, in dim halls, the abundance of light which was so necessary to give full value to the bright stuffs and metallic spangles worn by the dancers. And their own costumes, harmonized or contrasting with those of the dancers, afforded the variety of interest which otherwise, while the presenters were still limited to one or two 'truchmen', might have been lacking. They were always kept in strict subordination to the maskers proper. They were their attendants; Hinds in a mask of Clowns, Almains in a mask of Swart Rutters, Moorish friars in a mask of Moors. Their garments were inferior, taffeta, as against satin or cloth of gold. When George Ferrers, as Lord of Misrule in 1552, had occasion to complain of the apparel furnished by the Master of the Revels for his councillors, he wrote that the gentlemen who were to take the parts 'wolde not be seen in London so torchebererlyke disgysed for asmoche as they ar worthe or hope to be worthe'.[2] And when the measures began, they had little to do, but to stand

[1] The relation of the morris-dance to the folk is described in *The Mediaeval Stage*, i. 195, but I think that the history of the name requires further examination. There are traces of morris-dances at court in 1559 and 1579, and there was a sword-dance on 6 Jan. 1604.

[2] Feuillerat, *Edw. and Mary*, 59.

and look on.[1] In the seventeenth century they were not so indispensable, either for illumination, which could be better supplied by fixed lights upon the scene, or for variety.[2] And with the multiplication of other purposes the room which they took up could ill be spared. In *Tethys' Festival*, given exceptionally during the heat of summer, there were no torch-bearers, on the ground that 'they would have pestered the roome, which the season would not well permit'. And therewith begins a tendency either, as already indicated, to merge them in the antimask, or to omit them altogether.[3] The vizard again and the ceremonial unvizarding at the end of the performance, although usual, and of course essential parts of the tradition, do not appear to have been quite invariable under James I.[4] As early as the *Mask of Blackness* in 1605, blackened faces and arms were substituted, which, says a contemporary writer, were 'disguise sufficient' and an 'ugly sight', and the experiment was not repeated. I do not know that for any historic period there is evidence that the maskers regularly brought gifts with them, although they sometimes did, and one may suspect that such gifts represented the 'luck' of the primitive custom. A jewel was all very well when Arthur Throgmorton wanted to use a mask as a medium for recovering the lost favour of Elizabeth.[5] But it may be assumed that Elizabeth would think it a useless expense, when a mask was only conventionally a surprise visit, and was really designed on her own instructions in her own Office of the Revels. And although James did on one

[1] *Romeo and Juliet*, i. 4. 38, 'I'll be a candle-holder and look on'; cf. Reyher, 90, citing W. Rankins, *Mirrour of Monsters* (1587), 'There were certain petty fellows ready, as the custom is in maskes, to carry torches'; *Westward Hoe*, i. 2, 'He is just like a torch-bearer to maskers; he wears good clothes, and is ranked in good company, but he doth nothing'; Overbury, *Characters* (1614, ed. Rimbault, 55, *An Ignorant Glory Hunter*), 'In any shew he will be one, though he be but a whiffler or a torch-bearer'.

[2] A disguising of 1501 had already 'a goodly pageant made round after the fashion of a lanthorne cast out with many proper and goodly windows fenestred with fine lawne wher in were more than an hundred great lightes' (Reyher, 503).

[3] Before 1610 torch-bearers may have been omitted from *Hymenaei* and the *Haddington Mask*; after 1610, they are only noticed in *Oberon*, the *Lords' Mask*, and *Chapman's Mask*.

[4] The descriptions often say nothing of vizards, but probably they take them for granted, for as late as 1618 Chamberlain writes of the Gray's Inn *Mask of Mountebanks* (Birch, ii. 66), 'I cannot call it a masque, seeing they were not disguised, nor had vizards'. Similarly the unmasking is rarely described (*Indian and Chinese Knights*; *Twelve Goddesses*; *Hay Mask*), and may have been omitted as a formal stage, especially when the maskers danced off into the pageant.

[5] Cf. p. 168.

occasion pay no less than £40,000 for the jewel used in the mask of Indian and Chinese Knights, this was in the first year of his reign, when his predecessor's hoarded wealth was still there for the lavishing, and the special purpose was to be served of impressing Henri IV through his diplomatic representative.[1] When there were gifts, they were as a rule trifling, and incidental to the 'device' of the mask. The abortive scheme of 1562 provides for a grandguard and a sword and girdle. Elizabeth got on one occasion flowers of silk and gold, signifying victory, peace, and plenty; on another snowballs of lamb's wool sweetened with rose-water in a mask of Janus; on a third looking-glasses with posies inscribed on them in a mask of Pedlars. In *The Twelve Goddesses* the maskers presented their emblems, and Sibylla laid them in the temple. In the *Mask of Blackness* the Daughters of Niger presented their fans. In *Tethys' Festival* there were a trident for James and a sword, worth 20,000 crowns, and a scarf for Henry. In the *Mask of Squires* Anne plucked a bough from a golden tree, wherewith to disenchant the Knights. Often the gifts were represented by the merely conventional offering of a copy of verses, or of shields bearing *imprese* or painted allegorical devices, such as were also brought by the runners in tilts.[2] These sometimes required interpretation and led to some preliminary 'commoning' with the guests of honour. Interchanges of wit at this stage between Elizabeth and Mary Fitton in 1600 and James and Philip Herbert in 1604 are upon record. But of course the chief 'commoning' was when the maskers 'took out' the principal spectators of the opposite sex to dance. Whether the Jacobean maskers kissed the ladies whom they took out I do not know, but this was the earlier custom.[3] At any rate the 'taking out' is the critical moment of intimacy between performers and spectators in the mask, and serves, even more than the gifts and even more than the personal compliments in theme and speech, to distinguish it

[1] Cf. ch. xxiii (Daniel, *Twelve Goddesses*).

[2] Cf. ch. iv.

[3] *R. J.* i. 5. 95; *Hen. VIII*, i. 4. 95,

> I were unmannerly to take you out,
> And not to kiss you.

The amorous tradition of the 'commoning', which apparently frightened some of the ladies at Henry's court, survived under Elizabeth. In Lyly's *Euphues and his England* (*Works*, ii. 103), Philautus takes Camilla by the hand in a mask and begins 'to boord hir' in this manner, 'It hath ben a custome faire Lady, how commendable I wil not dispute, how common you know, that Masquers do therfore couer their faces that they may open their affections, & vnder y^e^ colour of a dance, discouer their whole desires'; cf. Reyher, 23.

from the drama.[1] The period of 'intermixed' dancing (*Hymenaei*), which it introduced, served as a sequel to the greater part of the mask proper, and is sometimes described as 'the revels' (*Love Freed*; *Twelve Months*). More precisely, the order of the dancing, subject to minor variations, was as follows. After the dialogue of presentation and the antimask, the maskers entered and began a series of 'masque dances' (*Oberon*; *Love Freed*), 'changes' (*Malecontent*; *Insatiate Countess*), or 'strains' (*Hymenaei*; *Cynthia's Revels*; *A Woman is a Weathercock*). These are also called the 'single' dances, to distinguish them from the 'intermixed' dances (*Blackness*) or more usually and simply, the maskers 'own' dances or the 'new' dances. Sometimes the 'first' dance is distinguished from the 'main' dance (*Twelve Months*; *Lords' Mask*; *Mercury Vindicated*; *Golden Age*). After one, two, or three 'new' dances, the maskers 'dissolved' (*Hymenaei*) and 'took out' for the 'revels'. Finally they gathered again for their 'going off' (*Twelve Months*), the 'last', 'parting', 'departing' or 'retiring' dance, which sometimes took them 'into the work' (*Oberon*). If they did not dance back 'into the work', they probably unmasked at this stage, after a ceremonial reverence to the company, known as the 'honour' (*Hay Mask*; *Your Five Gallants*; *A Woman is a Weathercock*).[2] The revels consisted partly of the solemn figured dances known as 'measures', partly of 'lighter' dances (*Hay Mask*). Those most often mentioned are the galliard, coranto, and lavolta; others were the brawl (*Browne's Mask*), duretto (*Beaumont's Mask*; *Mask of Flowers*), and morasco (*Mask of Flowers*).[3] Of course, only 'ordinary' measures (*Indian and Chinese Knights*) and familiar court dances were available for the revels. The mask dances proper, on the other hand, as the epithet 'new' indicates, were specially designed and carefully learnt for each occasion. They appear to have always been 'measures'. Baldassarino regards 'meslanges geometriques' as being of the essence of the mask. The dances were a technical matter, with which the poets were not much concerned, and they do not as a rule attempt any notation, or even detailed description of the figures. An occasional literary touch was, however, to their fancy. In *Hymenaei* some of the figures were 'formed into

[1] *Maid's Tragedy*, i. 1. 9, 'They must commend their King, and speak in praise Of the assembly, bless the Bride and Bridegroom, In person of some God; th'are tyed To rules of flattery'.

[2] This old phrase, known to Sir T. Elyot, *The Governour*, i. 22, is still traditional in folk dances.

[3] On these dances, cf. Reyher, 441.

letters very signifying to the name of the bridegroom ', and again in the *Mask of Queens* one of the dances was ' graphically disposed into letters, and honouring the name of the most sweet and ingenious Prince, Charles, Duke of York '. These graphic dances, which Bacon deprecates, were also used in the French *Ballet de Monseigneur le Duc de Vandosme* of 1610.[1]

It is of a piece with the intimacy between maskers and spectators that the former appear always to have been volunteers, and that to dance in a mask, at any rate at court, was not derogatory even to persons of the highest rank. I have no proof that Queen Elizabeth ever masked in person, as her father and brother certainly did, but in view of her notorious fondness for the exercise of the dance it is extremely probable. Unfortunately we know very little of the personnel of the Elizabethan masks. The *Revels Accounts*, a source of generous information on many points, never name the maskers. Scattered notices elsewhere suggest that they may not infrequently have been the maids of honour. It was so when Brantôme was present in 1561, and at Anne Russell's wedding in 1600, when Elizabeth, contrary to the ordinary rule of sex-exchange, was ' taken ' out by Mary Fitton. Among the stray names of revellers that have floated to us down the stream of time are those of George Brooke, who came to the scaffold in 1603, and Sir Robert Carey, who boasts of his share in all court triumphs in 1586.[2] Naunton is the authority for the statement that Sir Christopher Hatton first appeared before Elizabeth in one of the masks which were sent from time to time as the contributions of the Inns of Court to the royal gaiety.[3] Lists of the dancers in most of the Jacobean masks are preserved. That of James himself is not among them ; he was ungainly and indolent except on horseback. But Anne danced in her own ' Queen's ' masks of 1604, 1605, 1608, 1609, 1610, and probably 1611, and allowed herself to be ' taken out ' as a compliment to her hosts at Caversham as late as the summer of 1613. With her in 1610 was the Princess Elizabeth, and in 1608 and 1610 the Lady Arabella Stuart. Henry was ' taken out ' as a boy and ' tost from hand to hand like a tennis bal ' by the ladies in the *Twelve Goddesses* of 1604.

[1] Lacroix, i. 256, 262.

[2] Goodman, i. 70, ' George Brooks . . . brother to Cobham . . . was a great reveller at court in the masques where the queen and greatest ladies were ' ; Carey, 6, ' In all triumphs I was one ; either at tilt, tourney, or barriers, in masque or balls '.

[3] Naunton, 44, ' Sir Christopher Hatton came into the court . . . as a private gentleman of the inns of court in a mask, and for his activity and person, which was tall and proportionable, taken into favour '.

He masked himself in *Oberon* (1611) and in the undatable *Twelve Months*. The only appearance of Charles before 1618 was as Zephyrus amongst the presenters of *Tethys' Festival* (1610). Next to Anne herself, the most conspicuous performer in the Queen's masks was perhaps Lucy Countess of Bedford, who had already won her reputation as a 'fine dancing dame' at the end of the previous reign, and whose costume in one at least of her extant portraits is conjectured to represent masking attire.[1] Other names which recur frequently in the lists are those of Elizabeth Countess of Derby and her sister Susan Countess of Montgomery, Alethea Countess of Arundel, Anne Countess of Dorset, and Audrey Lady Walsingham; while amongst the men shone the two brothers Herbert, William Earl of Pembroke and Philip Earl of Montgomery, and that most splendid and extravagant of all the Jacobean courtiers, James Lord Hay. The Earl of Somerset does not appear to have been a dancer, but when the star of George Villiers was rising in 1615 his friends were careful to give him his opportunity of shining in a mask. It is not surprising to find that the numerous sons and daughters of the Earl of Suffolk, Lord Chamberlain, and the Earl of Worcester, Master of the Horse, who shared the official oversight of the masks, were not seldom called upon to display their skill. One fears that there must often have been heart-burnings. Lady Hatton's pique at being left out in 1605 contributed something to the strained relations with her husband, Lord Coke, which long made mirth for London.[2]

The masks could not dispense altogether with professional assistance. In the *Mask of Beauty* the torch-bearing Cupids were 'chosen out of the best and ingenious youth of the kingdom'. In *Tethys' Festival* the presenters included, in addition to the Duke of York, two gentlemen 'of good worth and respect', who played the Tritons, and the antimask included eight 'little ladies, all of them the daughters of Earls or Barons'. But this mask was for the exceptional occasion of the creation of Henry as Prince of Wales, and Daniel expressly boasts that 'there were none of inferior sort mixed among these great personages of state and honour (as usually there have been); but all was performed by themselves with a due reservation of their dignity'. The normal practice seems to have been to hire players and their

[1] C. C. Stopes, *A Lampoon on the Opponents of Essex, 1601* (*Sh.-Jahrbuch*, xlvi. 21); Reyher, 98, apparently referring to the full-length portrait by Marc Geeraerts at Woburn Abbey, reproduced in Henderson, *James I*, 232. It is a fantastic costume, but not obviously that of a mask.

[2] Winwood, ii. 40.

boys for the antimask and for the speaking parts, which of course required a trained elocution.[1] Sometimes, however, a part might be taken by one of the numerous persons employed as devisers or trainers. I do not know that the statement that 'Ben Jonson turned the globe of the earth standing behind the altar' in *Hymenaei* necessarily implies Jonson's personal presence on the stage, actor though he had been, for in fact the globe seems to have been moved by unseen machinery, without even the apparent assistance of a presenter. But the dance-masters Thomas Giles and Jerome Heron certainly played the Cyclopes in the *Haddington Mask*, and Giles also played Thamesis in the *Mask of Beauty*. The musicians again, some or all of whom were generally disguised, were a professional body, of which the nucleus was probably formed by members of the various bands of the royal households. Thus John Allen, who sang in the *Mask of Queens* and the *Mask of Squires*, was 'her majesty's servant', and Nicholas Lanier, who also sang in the *Mask of Squires*, was one of the King's flutes. Both musicians and dancing-masters had other important functions in connexion with the masks, outside the actual performances. The former had to compose the airs and set them for the musical instruments and the dances; the latter had to arrange the dances and to drill the dancers.[2] Campion, being a composer as well as a poet, was naturally responsible for his own music, and the musical element in his masks tended to be predominant. Jonson seems generally to have obtained the co-operation of Alfonso Ferrabosco, probably a son of the Ferrabosco who was devising masks for Elizabeth about 1572.[3] He was originally a lutenist, but at the time of his death in 1627 'enjoyed four places, viz. a musician's place in general, a composer's place, a violl's place, and an instructor's place to the prince in the art of musique'.[4] Amongst the musicians who gave minor assistance, either as composers or

[1] *Dekker His Dream* (1620, *Works*, iii. 7), 'I herein imitate the most courtly revellings; for if Lords be in the grand masque, in the antimasque are players'; Jonson, *Love Restored* (*Works*, iii. 83). 'The rogue play-boy, that acts Cupid, is got so hoarse, your majesty cannot hear him half the breadth of your chair'. The accounts for *Oberon* include £10 to 'xiij[n] Holt boyes' and £15 to 'players imployed in the maske'; those for *Love Freed* £10 to '5 boyes, that is 3 Graces Sphynx and Cupid', and £12 to 'the 12 fooles that danced', and those for the *Lords' Mask* £1 each to '12 madfolkes' and '5 speakers' (Reyher, 508).

[2] The rehearsals were a serious business, lasting in 1616 no less than fifty days; cf. Reyher, 35. There were dress rehearsals; cf. Osborne in note to p. 206, *infra*.

[3] Cf. p. 163, and *D. N. B.*, s.v. Ferrabosco.

[4] Lafontaine, 63.

as executants, were Thomas Ford (*Chapman's Mask*), John Cooper (*Lords*; *Squires*), the lutenists Robert Johnson (*Oberon*; *Love Freed*; *Lords*; *Chapman's Mask*), John and Robert Dowland (*Chapman's Mask*), and Philip Rossiter (*Chapman's Mask*), and the violinists Thomas Lupo the elder (*Hay Mask*; *Oberon*; *Love Freed*; *Lords*), Rowland Rubidge (*Oberon*), and Alexander Chisan (*Oberon*).[1] As dancing-masters we hear of Thomas Cardell under Elizabeth in 1582;[2] and under James of Jerome Heron (*Haddington Mask*; *Queens*; *Oberon*; *Lords*), Confess (*Oberon*; *Love Freed*), Bochan (*Love Freed*; *Lords*), and Thomas Giles (*Hymenaei*; *Beauty*; *Haddington Mask*; *Queens*; *Oberon*; *Lords*), who was musician and teacher of the dance to Henry, and may be identical with the Thomas Giles who became Master of the Paul's boys in 1584.[3]

The court masks ordinarily took place in what was called the banqueting-house, but might with more appropriateness have been called the masking-house, at Whitehall.[4] The occasional exceptions readily explain themselves. Whitehall was under the ban of plague in the winter of 1604, and the masks were in the great hall of Hampton Court. During the winter of 1606, when the Elizabethan banqueting-house had been pulled down and the Jacobean one was not yet ready, the great hall of Whitehall itself was used. Here also was given *Chapman's Mask*, on the second night of the Princess Elizabeth's wedding, doubtless because the banqueting-house was still encumbered with the scenery belonging to the *Lords' Mask* of the previous night. The hall had also been assigned to *Beaumont's Mask* on the third night, but when this was put off for a few days, the greater dignity of the banqueting-house was granted as a compensation for the disappointment of the dancers. The aspect of the room and its arrangements are well described in 1618, only a year before the first Jacobean banqueting-house was burnt down, by Orazio Busino, almoner to the Venetian ambassador, Piero Contarini.[5] This may be supplemented by Campion's descrip-

[1] Reyher, 79. [2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 356. [3] Reyher, 78.

[4] *Blackness* certainly and *Hymenaei* probably were in the Elizabethan room. The Jacobean room was first used for *Beauty* (10 Jan. 1608). It was also used for *Queens*, *Oberon*, *Lords*, *Beaumont's*, *Squires*, and *Flowers*, and probably for all others from 1608 to 1616 except *Chapman's*.

[5] Busino, *Anglopotrida* (*V. P.* xv. 110), describing Jonson's *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* on 6 Jan. 1618, 'A large hall is fitted up like a theatre, with well secured boxes all round. The stage is at one end and his Majesty's chair in front under an ample canopy. Near him are stools for the foreign ambassadors. . . . Whilst waiting for the king we amused ourselves admiring the decorations and beauty of the house with its two orders of columns,

tion of the great hall at Whitehall as arranged for the mask at Lord Hay's wedding, and by the careful note of John Finett, then an assistant to the Master of the Ceremonies, upon the seating of the ambassadors in 1616.[1] At the lower or screen end was the scene; at the upper end, and divided from the scene by the dancing-place, was the royal 'state', on a raised daïs and under a canopy. Behind the state, along the sides of the room to right and left of the dancing-place, and in galleries above, were tiers of seats, some of which were divided into boxes. James himself seems always to have been present, returning if necessary from his hunting journeys for mask nights, and sometimes starting off again the next morning at daybreak. Busino's account suggests that he liked to see vigorous and sustained dancing; but his patience failed him when he was asked to sit through three masks on successive nights in 1613, and he insisted on putting off the third, although the maskers had already come, telling Sir Francis Bacon, who protested that this was to bury them quick, that the alternative was to bury him quick, for he could last no longer. On the other hand, he was sufficiently gratified by the *Irish Mask* in 1613 and *Mercury Vindicated* in 1615 to be willing to call for a second performance in each case. With the King sat members of the royal family and sometimes ambassadors or other specially honoured guests. Finett records that in 1616 the French, Venetian, and Savoyard ambassadors were all on the King's right hand, but in places

one above the other, their distance from the wall equalling the breadth of the passage, that of the second row being upheld by Doric pillars, while above these rise Ionic columns supporting the roof. The whole is of wood, including even the shafts, which are carved and gilt with much skill. From the roof of these hang festoons and angels in relief with two rows of lights. Then such a concourse as there was, for although they profess only to admit the favoured ones who are invited, yet every box was filled notably with most noble and richly arrayed ladies, in number some 600 and more according to the general estimate; . . . On entering the house, the cornets and trumpets to the number of fifteen or twenty began to play very well a sort of recitative, and then after his Majesty had seated himself under the canopy alone, the queen not being present on account of a slight indisposition, he caused the ambassadors to sit below him on two stools, while the great officers of the crown and courts of law sat upon benches. The Lord Chamberlain then had the way cleared and in the middle of the theatre there appeared a fine and spacious area carpeted all over with green cloth. In an instant a large curtain dropped, painted to represent a tent of gold cloth with a broad fringe; the background was of canvas painted blue, powdered all over with golden stars. This became the front arch of the stage.'

[1] Finett, 32. The plan from *Lansd.* 1171 in Reyher, 346, dates from 1635 and represents the great Hall arranged not for a mask but for a pastoral; but the general scheme was probably much the same.

of nicely graded dignity, ' not right out, but byas forward '. The ambassadorial suites appear to have been accommodated in boxes raised above the level of the state, to the right and left. Guests of honour, but of lesser honour, might be placed on special benches assigned to lords and privy councillors. Evidently the masks were solemn occasions, and the laws of precedence strictly followed. An allusion in *The Maid's Tragedy* suggests that ladies, other than those ladies of the court and ambassadors' wives who formed the king's ' troop ', were ordinarily seated in the galleries.[1] One of the principal objects of the masks was the entertainment of ambassadors, and the jealousies amongst them were constantly involving James and his Council in awkward diplomatic questions.[2] These have recently been the subject of a special study, and need not here be described in detail.[3] By far the most important was the standing conflict for precedence between the representatives of France and Spain. James consistently refused to commit himself to either claim, and was careful not to invite both ambassadors to the same function.[4] But some occasions were more honourable than others, and it seems clear that in the minds of the ambassadors themselves the bestowal or withholding of an invitation often counted for a diplomatic triumph or rebuff. Matters were complicated during the earlier years of the reign by Anne's far from discreet advocacy of the Spanish cause, and the dispatches of M. de Beaumont in 1605 and M. de la Boderie in 1608 are largely occupied with the embarrassment caused to James and the humiliation inflicted upon those ambassadors themselves by the Queen's determination that her masks should be graced by the presence of the astute and courtly Spaniard, Juan de Taxis. In the latter year James had to stave off an open rupture with Henri IV by an opportune demand for the repayment of a long-standing debt. The relations between France and Spain were paralleled by similar feuds for precedence between Venice and Flanders and between Florence and Savoy, while the King of Spain was naturally unwilling that his representative should be received on terms of equality with the representative of Holland and thus appear to acknowledge the claims of rebellious provinces to

[1] *Maid's Tragedy*, i. 2. 32.

[2] Birch, i. 24 (27 Nov. 1603), ' many plays and shows are bespoken, to give entertainment to our ambassadors '.

[3] Sullivan, *Court Masques of James I*; cf. my notes on the individual masks in ch. xxiii.

[4] De Silva's dispatches of 1564–6 (cf. p. 26) show that a precisely similar situation had established itself at Elizabeth's court.

rank as a sovereign state. Occasional visitors of rank had their own points of etiquette to raise. Thus in 1604 the Duke of Holstein stood for three hours rather than sit below the Venetian ambassador. Generally speaking, indeed, the newly established office of Master of the Ceremonies must have been anything but a bed of roses. The chief mask of the year, which every ambassador intrigued to attend, was traditionally danced on Twelfth Night; but often it was put off to a later date, in order to meet diplomatic exigencies.[1]

The banqueting-house, with the 'state' in it, was probably regarded as technically part of the Presence Chamber. At any rate, it was under the supervision of the Lord Chamberlain and the officers of the Chamber, headed by the Gentleman Usher. They seated the audience, kept the doors against the turbulent crowds knocking for admission, cleared the dancing-place when the King was seated, and supplied the principal guests with programmes or abstracts of the device prepared by the poet.[2] The Chamberlain's white staff was no mere symbol when there was whiffling to be done, and even Ben Jonson, 'ushered by my Lord Suffolk from a mask' on 6 January 1604, the year before his own sovereignty over masks began, required to be consoled by his fellow in misfortune, Sir John Roe, with the reminder,—

> Forget we were thrust out; it is but thus,
> God threatens Kings, Kings Lords, as Lords do us.[3]

Obviously, as John Chamberlain suggests in a letter to Dudley Carleton, to be befriended at court was to secure the easier admission. But subject to the limitations of space and the discretion of the door-keepers, the performances seem to have been open to all comers, although the wicked wit of the dramatists is apt to suggest that citizens' wives sometimes

[1] Beaumont in *B. M. Kings MS.* cxxiv, f. 328, 'le . . . ballet . . . de la Reine qui se devoit danser au vendredy dernier jour des festes de Noël selon la façon d'Angleterre et le plus honnorable pour la ceremonie qui s'y obserue de tout temps publiquement'; Finett, 6, 'il se pourroit soustenir que le dernier jour seroit a prendre pour le plus gran jour comm'il s'entend en plusiours autres cas, et nommement aux festes de Noel, que le Jour des Roys qui est le dernier se prend pour le plus gran jour'. The chief masks of 1606–7, 1611–12, 1613–14, and 1614–16, were on 6 Jan. In 1603–4, 1607–8, and 1608–9, the Queen's masks were planned for that day, but put off. In 1605–6 and 1609–10 the day was given to barriers.

[2] Cf. p. 39. The accounts for the *Lords' Mask* include fees of £1 each to three Grooms of the Chamber; those of *Chapman's Mask*, given exceptionally in the great Hall, £1 to the Ushers of the Hall. The manuscript of the *Mask of Blackness* appears to be an abstract for use at the performance. In 1613 a Groom of the Chamber was also paid £7 for 42 nights watching in the banqueting-house while workmen were there (*Chamber Accounts*).

[3] Donne, *Poems* (ed. Grierson), i. 414; cf. Jonson, *Conversations*, 10.

found access more readily than the citizens themselves.[1] It is difficult to say how many the room would hold. One of De la Boderie's dispatches speaks of 10,000, which was probably a considerable over-estimate.[2] Many of those who besieged the doors must of course have been disappointed, and perhaps many of those who got in experienced more satisfaction than comfort.[3] In order to save space, it was decreed in 1613 that no ladies should be admitted in farthingales, and the repetition of the *Irish Mask* of 1613 and the *Mercury Vindicated* of 1615 may have been due in part to an unsatisfied demand for seats as well as to the intrinsic merit of the performances.

The mask, beginning after supper, was prolonged far into the night. That at Sir Philip Herbert's wedding lasted three hours; *Tethys' Festival* was not over until hard upon sunrise. The pent-up audience dissolved in some confusion. Apparently the Tudor custom of finishing the proceedings by rifling the pageant and the dresses of their decorations had not been wholly abandoned.[4] A hardly less riotous scene followed. A banquet was spread in another room, the great chamber in 1605, the presence chamber in 1616, the specially

[1] *Four Plays in One*, 2, 'Down with those City-Gentlemen, &c. Out with those —— I say, and in with their wives at the back door'; *Love Restored*, 'By this time I saw a fine citizen's wife or two let in; and that figure provoked me exceedingly to take it'. Here Robin Goodfellow is recounting his various attempts to secure admission, as an engineer, a tirewoman, a musician, a feather-maker of Blackfriars and the like. Carleton wrote of the mask on 27 Dec. 1604 (*S. P. Dom. Jac. I*, xii. 6), 'One woeman among the rest lost her honesty for which she was caried to the porters lodge being surprised at her bassnes on the top of the taras'.

[2] *Ambassades*, iii. 13.

[3] Osborne, *James*, 75, 'So disobliging were the most grateful pleasures of the Court; whose masks and other spectacles, though they wholly intended them for show, and would not have been pleased without great store of company, yet did not spare to affront such as come to see them; which accuseth the King no less of folly, in being at so vast an expense for that which signified nothing but in relation to pride and lust, than the spectators (I mean such as were not invited) of madness, who did not only give themselves the discomposure of body attending such irregular hours, but to others an opportunity to abuse them. Nor could I, that had none of their share who passed through the most incommodious access, count myself any great gainer (who did ever find some time before the grand night to view the scene) after I had reckoned my attendance and sleep; there appearing little observable besides the company, and what Imagination might conjecture from the placing of the Ladies and the immense charge and universal vanity in clothes, &c.'

[4] Jonson, *Mask of Blackness*, 7, 'Little had been done to the study of magnificence in these, if presently with the rage of the people, who (as a part of greatness) are privileged by custom to deface their carcases, the spirits had also perished'; cf. Halle, i. 27, 117. At *Tethys' Festival* the Duke of York and six young noblemen led off the maskers 'to avoid the confusion which usually attendeth the desolve of these shewes'.

built ' marriage ' room in 1613. It was not etiquette for the King to partake of this with his guests, but he usually conducted the maskers to the tables, and took a survey of them before he retired. Then the fray began. The banquet was ' dispatched with the accustomed confusion ', says a chronicler in 1604. In 1605 it ' was so furiously assaulted that down went tables and tressels before one bit was touched '. *Tethys' Festival* in 1610 closed with ' views and scrambling '. At Beaumont's mask in 1613, ' after the King had made the tour of the tables, everything was in a moment rapaciously swept away '.[1] Tired and unfed, the ladies made their way out into the courtyards of the palace, perhaps to find, as in 1604, that chains and jewels were gone, and that they were even ' made shorter by the skirts '.[2]

Next day the poets sat down to turn the programmes into books, which the stationers could print and sell at sixpence each, and so save them from being pestered for copies of the verses.[3] And the Lord Chamberlain's Secretary sat down to compare his expenses with his imprests, and to draw up his accounts for endorsement by his lord and the Master of the Horse, and presentation at the Exchequer. Any estimate of the cost of masking that we can now form must be approximate in character. Under Elizabeth, so long as masks were the care of the Revels, their expenses naturally appear in the accounts of that office; but in part only, since requisitions appear to have been made upon the Wardrobe and the Office of Works, and the services rendered by these departments not charged to the Revels. Moreover, the methods of bookkeeping employed by the officers of the Revels did not provide for distinguishing expenditure upon masks and upon plays when, as was usually the case, both types of entertainment were in concurrent preparation.[4] It is therefore rarely that the cost of an Elizabethan mask can be isolated, and still more rarely that it can be assumed to be complete. Four masks in the winter of 1559 only cost the Revels £127 11*s.* 2*d.*, and it was estimated that two more at Shrovetide would cost another £100. The spectacular mask in June 1572 cost £506 11*s.* 8*d.*, but it is noted that the ' Warderobe stuf ' was ' excepted '

[1] Cf. ch. xxiii; also Busino in *V. P.* xv. 114.

[2] Winwood, ii. 43.

[3] On 2 Feb. 1604, the Earl of Worcester wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury of *The Twelve Goddeses* (Lodge, iii. 87), ' I have been at sixpence charge with you to send you the book '. He adds that the books of another *ballet* were ' all called in '. After the *Mask of Beauty* Lord Lisle wrote to Shrewsbury (Lodge, App. 102) that he could not get the verses, because Jonson was busy writing more for the Haddington wedding.

[4] Cf. ch. iii.

from the reckoning. An estimate for another spectacular mask in April 1581 amounts to about £380, and again it is clear that the materials for garments are not included. It is rather surprising to find that a mask intended to accompany the embassy to Scotland at the time of James VI's wedding cost no more than £17 10*s.* 10*d.*, but this was a simple mask without a pageant, and garments already in store were 'translated' for the purpose.[1] Nor did Elizabeth desire to do any excessive honour to her cousin. On the other hand, the accounts, and particularly the inventories attached to those for the earliest years of the reign, show that the richest materials were used without stint to deck out the maskers. Clothes of gold and silver, shot with innumerable hues and often further enriched with embroidered 'works', velvets and sarcenets, satins, taffetas, and damasks; all recur in a truly royal profusion, and at a cost of anything up to a guinea or so a yard. The cheaper stuffs were no doubt used for torch-bearers, and there was room for economy in the Cologne and Venice gold and silver and other forms of tinsel that served for fringes and trimmings.[2] Copper lace, as the Duke of Newcastle gravely informed Charles II at the Restoration, looked as well as gold for the two or three nights before it tarnished: 'All Queen Elizabethes dayes shee had itt, & Kinge James.'[3] Burghley's reorganization of the Revels in 1597 apparently left the office without any responsibility for the preparation of masks, and it is not clear what arrangements were made for these during the last few years of the reign. Under James the Revels claimed fees for the personal attendance of the officers at masks, for the lighting of the banqueting-house, for small repairs to its fittings, and for no more.[4] Small sums also appear in the accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber for services of the mat-layer in making ready the dancing-floor, and of Grooms of the Chamber in attendance on the maskers, and in those of the Office of Works for the erection of stages and scaffolds. The incidence of the main expenditure of course depended upon whether

[1] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 110, 153, 168, 345, 392.

[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 18, 112, *et passim.*

[3] Newcastle, *On Government* (S. A. Strong, *Cat. of Documents at Welbeck*, 223). The direct reference is to tilts, but an earlier passage runs, 'Well S^r^ Then your Ma^tie^ is well returned to White-Halle & ther prepare a maske for twelve-tyde,—Etaliens makes the Seanes beste,—& all butt your Ma^tie^ maye have their Glorius Atier off Coper which will doe as well for two or three nightes as Silver or Golde & much less charge, which otherwise will bee much founde falte withall by those thatt attendes your Ma^tie^ in the maske'.

[4] Cunningham, 203–17; cf. ch. iii.

the mask was ordered by James himself, or contributed out of the loyalty of others. James appears to have paid, in whole or in part, for at least fourteen of the twenty-five court masks traceable during the years 1603–16. These include the six Queen's masks (*Twelve Goddesses*, *Blackness*, *Beauty*, *Queens*, *Tethys' Festival*, *Love Freed*), two Prince's masks (*Oberon*, *Love Restored*), and five other masks by lords and gentlemen, one at the first Christmas of the reign (*Indian and Chinese Knights*), one at his daughter's wedding (*Lords*), one at Somerset's (*Squires*), and two of later date (*Mercury Vindicated*, *Golden Age Restored*). He may also have paid for the *Mask of Scots* in 1604 and the *Irish Mask* in 1613, but these were probably non-spectacular and cheap. As to the finance of the Winchester mask of 1603 and of the *Twelve Months* nothing is known, or whether the latter, evidently planned for a Prince's mask, was ever in fact performed. To *Oberon* and *Love Restored* James contributed amounts of at least £387 and at least £280 respectively, but so far as *Oberon* is concerned this was by no means the whole cost, for a sum of £1,076 6*s.* 10*d.* was charged to Henry's personal account, and it is probable that the burden of *Love Restored* was similarly divided. I have no evidence that Anne's personal account was ever charged with any part of the cost of the Queen's masks. Certainly it was not so with *Love Freed* in 1611, for of this mask, and of this alone, a full balance-sheet happens to be available. It was a comparatively cheap mask, deliberately so, because *Tethys' Festival* in the summer before had been ' excessively costly '. It was intended that it should cost no more than £600. In fact the total expenditure came to £719 1*s.* 3*d.* Of this £238 16*s.* 10*d.* went to Inigo Jones on ' his byll ', doubtless for the scenery ; £69 17*s.* 5*d.* in minor items of costume ; £292 in ' rewards ', making a total of £600 14*s.* 3*d.*, of which £400 had already been received from the Exchequer. This agrees closely with the original estimate, but there was a further amount of £118 7*s.* due to the Master of the Wardrobe for materials which he had supplied for costumes, and the document concludes with a memorandum signed by the Earls of Suffolk and Worcester to the effect that this amount, over and above the £600 14*s.* 3*d.*, is payable. These lords, one as Lord Chamberlain, the other as Master of the Horse, seem regularly to have had the supervision of ' emptions and provisions for masks given at the royal expense.[1] The financial procedure was as follows. At an early date, the King directed a warrant under the privy

[1] They certainly supervised *Queens*, *Tethys' Festival*, *Love Freed*, *Lords' Mask*.

seal to the Exchequer, in which the names of the supervising officers were set out, and the Treasurer was authorized to make payments upon certificates by them.[1] A letter of 1608 suggests that up to that date it had been usual to name a maximum cost in the warrant, but thenceforward the supervising officers seem normally to have had a free hand.[2] Their own methods varied. Sometimes they asked the Exchequer, as occasion arose, to pay small sums direct to Inigo Jones and others; sometimes they wrote acknowledgements on the bills of furnishers, and sent these forward for Exchequer payment; sometimes they authorized a subordinate officer to draw one or two large sums and meet the expenditure out of these. For 'rewards' no doubt the last was the more convenient way. We find one Bethell, a gentleman usher of the chamber, thus designated as payee in 1608, Henry Reynolds in 1609, Meredith Morgan in 1612, 1613, 1614, and 1616, Walter James in 1615, and Edmund Sadler in 1616.[3] The balance-sheet for *Love Freed*, although it contains items for the dresses of the presenters, antimaskers, and musicians, contains none which can be assigned to those of the main maskers, and there is other evidence for thinking that, even in a royal mask, the lords or ladies who danced were expected to dress themselves. Thus John Chamberlain tells us of the *Mask of Squires* that the King was to bear the charge, 'all saving the apparel'. The practice, however, was probably not invariable, for the Exchequer documents relating to *Tethys' Festival* contain a silkman's bill for lace used for the dresses of fourteen ladies. For the *Twelve Goddesses* warrants were issued to Lady Suffolk and Lady Walsingham to take Queen Elizabeth's robes from the wardrobe in the Tower. The list of 'rewards' for *Love Freed* can be supplemented from similar lists for *Oberon* and the *Lords' Mask* and a few scattered records. The largest amounts went to the poets and the architect. Jones had £50 for the *Lords' Mask* and £40 each for *Love Freed* and *Oberon*, Jonson £40 for *Love Freed*, Daniel £20 for *Tethys' Festival*, Campion, being both poet and musician, £66 13*s.* 4*d.* for the *Lords' Mask*. Dancers and composers got from £10 to £40; lutenists and violinists £1 or £2; players £1 each. For the total cost we are mainly reduced to guess-work, although contemporary gossip, some-

[1] The privy seal of 1 Dec. 1608 for *Queens* is in *S. P. D. Jac. I*, xxxviii. 1, and that of 7 Jan. 1613 for the *Lords' Mask* in Collier, i. 364; a certificate of 25 May 1610 for *Tethys' Festival* is printed by Sullivan, 219, from *S. P. D. Jac. I*, liv. 74.

[2] Sullivan, 201, misdated 27 Nov. 1607 for 1608, from *S. P. D. Jac. I*, xxxvii. 96. The mask was *Queens*.

[3] Reyher, 508, 520; cf. ch. xxiii.

times a little disturbed at the extravagance, may help us, if it was not itself based on guess-work.[1] We hear of £2,000 to £3,000 for the *Twelve Goddesses* and the two other masks of the first winter, £3,000 and 25,000 *scudi* for *Blackness*, 6,000 or 7,000 and later 30,000 *scudi* for *Beauty*, £1,500 for *Mercury Vindicated*, £2,000 for *Queens*, which, however, M. Reyher estimates from Exchequer documents which he does not print, at more than £4,000.[2] These figures probably include the contributions of the Wardrobe, as these were to be repaid out of the special allowances in 1611. There is yet one other source of information. A return of extraordinary disbursements of the Exchequer for 1603–9, during which period there were six or seven royal masks, gives £4,215 under this head, and a similar return for 1603–17, during which there were from fourteen to sixteen, including the *Vision of Delight* in 1617, gives £7,500.[3] But this last figure is specifically stated not to include 'the provisions had out of the Warderobe and materials and workmen from the Office of the Works'. At a venture, I should say that a royal mask cost about £2,000 on the average. Something may also be gleaned about the finance of those masks that were not wholly charged on the Exchequer. *Oberon*, to which both James and Henry contributed, was supervised by the chamberlain of Henry's household, Sir Thomas Chaloner. The Inns of Court masks brought to the Princess Elizabeth's wedding were paid for out of admission fees to chambers and levies raised upon the members of the Inns, according to their status. Chamberlain estimated the cost of the two masks as 'better than £4,000', and the accounts that have been preserved show that in fact Chapman's mask cost Lincoln's Inn and the Middle Temple £1,086 8*s.* 11*d.* each, and Beaumont's cost Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple over £1,200 each. On the other hand, the whole cost of the *Mask of Flowers*, given by Gray's Inn at the Earl of Somerset's wedding, being over £2,000, was met by Sir Francis Bacon, who refused an offered contribution of £500 from Sir Henry Yelverton. The masks at the weddings of Sir Philip Herbert, Lord Essex, Lord Hay, and Lord Haddington were all, certainly or probably, complimentary offerings of friends of the hymeneal couples. Lady Rutland, who danced in *Hymenaei*, paid £80 to Bethell, and £26 11*s.*

[1] W. ffarington writes on 7 Feb. 1609 (*Chetham Soc.* xxxix. 151), 'The Comonalty do somewhat murmur at such vaine expenses and thinke that that money worth bestowed other waies might have been conferred upon better use, but *quod supra nos, nihil ad nos*'. [2] Reyher, 72.

[3] Collier, i. 349; *Abstract*, 13. The *Lords' Mask* is separately reckoned at £400. This was just about the amount of the 'rewards'.

more for her own apparel. The *Haddington Mask* cost each of the twelve dancers £300, and must therefore have been one of the most expensive masks of the period. Obviously the highest estimates for the masks do not include the value of the jewels with which the dancers bedizened themselves. In the *Twelve Goddesses* Anne is said to have worn £100,000 worth and the other ladies £20,000 worth. Of *Hymenaei* John Pory says, 'I think they hired and borrowed all the principall jewels and ropes of perle both in court and citty. The Spanish ambassador seemed but poore to the meanest of them.' Even this Chamberlain could cap for *Beauty*. 'One lady, and that under a baroness, is said to be furnished for better than a hundred thousand pounds. And the Lady Arabella goes beyond her; and the queen must not come behind.' Thus they revelled it.

VII

THE COURT PLAY

[*Bibliographical Note.*—The books cited at the head of ch. iii, with F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914), provide material for this chapter; cf. A. Thaler, *The Players at Court* (1920, *J. G. P.* xix. 19).]

THE foregoing chapters have illustrated the overflow of the Renaissance passion for drama, taking shape in the spectacular enrichment of elements in court life which were not originally mimetic in their intention; the welcome, the exercise of arms, the dance. They are subordinate in their interest to us, as they were in fact subordinate by reason of their occasional character to the play itself, which formed, both in Elizabeth's reign and in that of James, the staple amusement of the court winter. The ordinary season for plays was a comparatively restricted one. Traditionally it began with All Saints, but Elizabeth at least rarely reached her winter quarters by the beginning of November, and her revels began with the Christmas festival itself, the twelve days of ancient licence in Calends and Saturnalia that extended from Nativity to Epiphany.[1] Within this period the three feasts of St. Stephen, St. John, and the Innocents, with New Year's Day and Twelfth Night, were nearly always gladdened by play or mask. Sometimes one of them was omitted, and sometimes, in substitution or addition, another day, often the Sunday in Christmas week, was selected. I know no record of a play on Christmas Day itself. Chamberlain writes in January 1608, 'The king was very earnest to have one on Christmas night, though, as I take it, he and the prince received that day, but the Lords told him it was not the fashion. Which answer pleased him not a whit, but said, "What do you tell me of the fashion? I will make it a fashion."'[2] But the Chamber accounts show that he dropped the point. After Twelfth Night there was a lull, broken perhaps by an occasional play, notably on February 2 at Candlemas, until a group of two or three at Shrovetide brought revelling to a conclusion before the rigours of Lent. This was the close of the official season, and the Revels office had now little to think of but the annual airing of the wardrobe stuff, at any rate until the progress came round.

[1] On the earlier custom cf. S. Cox (App. C, No. xliv). Buggin's memorandum on the Revels in 1573 (*Tudor Revels*, 36) contemplates the possibility of service at 'Hollantide'.

[2] Birch, i. 69.

The longest number of plays given before Elizabeth in any one winter was probably in 1600–1, when there were eleven. During the greater part of the reign the number ranged from six to ten. For some of the earliest years only two or three are on record. It is possible that a few may have escaped notice owing to the absence of a 'reward', or conceivably the charge of a reward to funds other than those covered by the very complete accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber.[1] Naturally, if an Inn of Court or gentlemen such as the sons of Sir Percival Hart played, they did not take a money payment. The schoolboys of Eton and Westminster did, but the latter perhaps not from the very beginning. The only winter for which the Treasurer of the Chamber records no rewards is that of the plague year 1563–4. But the Revels Office provided for three plays at Windsor, and if it was thought dangerous to bring companies from London or elsewhere to court, Eton or the Windsor choir would have been the natural substitutes. In 1574 again the Revels Office were furnishing plays at Windsor and Reading by Italians, no payments to whom can be traced. Elizabeth occasionally ordered a mask outside the winter season, for some such purpose as the entertainment of an ambassador. I do not find clear evidence that she ever ordered a play. But, both in winter and in summer, she was from time to time present at a play given by some one else, in progress or at a wedding or banquet in London.[2]

[1] Cf. App. B. The *Revels Accounts* record plays which the Treasurer of the Chamber did not reward, by the Chapel (1559–60); by unnamed companies (3 plays) at Windsor (1503–4); by Westminster (*Miles Gloriosus*; cf. Murray, ii. 168), the Chapel, Sir Percival Hart's sons, and 'showes' by Gray's Inn (1564–5); by an unnamed company (1567–8); by an unnamed company (1581–2); and by Gray's Inn (*Misfortunes of Arthur*, 1587–8). For years not covered by these accounts must be added the Inner Temple *Gorboduc* (1562), probably their *Gismond of Salerne* (1566 ?), and not impossibly others by Gray's Inn, who, according to Elizabeth in 1595 (*Gesta Grayorum*, 68), 'did always study for Sports to present unto her'. I cannot understand Collier's unreferenced notice of a payment to men of George Evelyn (cf. ch. xiii) for a play in 1588. A letter of 4 Dec. 1592 from the University of Cambridge (*M. S. C.* i. 198, from *Lansd. MS.* 71), deprecating an invitation to play an English comedy at court, shows that a similar suggestion had been made to Oxford; there is no evidence that either University actually played. It is conceivable that plays may sometimes have been rewarded out of the Privy Purse (cf. ch. ii) instead of by the Treasurer of the Chamber.

[2] Cf. Calendar, *s.a.* 1559 (7 Aug., Paul's at Nonsuch), 1564 (5 July, play at Mr. Sackville's), 1567 (April 13, play before Elizabeth and Spanish ambassador), 1575 (plays on progress at Lichfield by Warwick's, at Kenilworth, and at Woodstock), 1578 (Aug., Ipswich play at Stowmarket), 1579 (play at Osterley), 1595 (Jan., probable performance of *M. N. D.* at Derby's wedding), 1601 (Aug., 'playing-wenches' at Caversham), 1601 (29 Dec., play at Hunsdon's in Blackfriars). There are also, of course,

James gave the impression, when he first came to England, of taking, unlike Queen Anne and Prince Henry, 'no extraordinary pleasure' in plays.[1] But he had a great many more than his predecessor, and reverted in some years to the early practice of opening the play season at the beginning of November. Nor, on the other hand, was he strict in his observance of Lent, and in some years the performances continued at intervals until after Easter. During his first winter he saw eleven plays and gradually increased this number, reaching a maximum of twenty-three in 1609–10. Up to 1615 he never saw less than eleven, except during 1612–13, the winter of Henry's death, when the number fell to seven. Moreover, even when he himself escaped to a hunting-box, he was liberal in ordering additional plays for the prince and court, and yet others seem to have been charged to the private funds of Anne and the royal children.[2] The records do not in all years give the dates of individual performances; but in 1611–12, to take one example, the programme was as follows. The King himself was present at plays on October 31, November 1, and November 5, on the four nights after Christmas, on January 5, on Candlemas, and on Shrove Sunday and Tuesday. On January 6 was the mask. Most of the intervening days he spent in visits to his various hunting quarters. Meanwhile there were at least twenty-six other plays before one or more of the royal children, at which Anne was probably also present. Two of these were in November, one in the middle of December, one in Christmas week, eight in January after Twelfth night, and nine in February, both before and after Lent had begun. Two plays at the end of March and three in April, none of these in the King's presence, exhausted the official supply, but not the enthusiasm of Prince Henry. He spent a fortnight with Anne at Greenwich during January, and there was 'every night a play', some of which the Queen probably paid for; and in March he was entertained by the Marquis of Winchester at supper, again with plays.[3] Occasionally James ordered a play during the summer; there were four for the entertainment of the King of Denmark in 1606, of which one,

the plays at Oxford and Cambridge (cf. ch. iv). For these no money reward was paid, but the Works and Revels met some of the expenses, and the actors got a warrant for venison out of Woodstock to make a feast.

[1] Cf. p. 7.

[2] Cf. App. B, *s.a.* 1612–13, 1615–16.

[3] For other entertainments of the court with plays by private hosts, cf. Calendar *s.a.* 1605 (3 Jan., play by Spanish ambassador for Duke of Holst; 9 < > 14 Jan., *Love's Labour's Lost* by Southampton or Cranborne for Anne), 1607 (May 25, *Aeneas and Dido* by Arundel for Prince de Joinville).

by the Paul's boys, is not traceable in the Chamber accounts, and one for the Duke of Savoy's ambassador in 1613. All plays at the Jacobean court was given by professional companies; if the lawyers came to court, it was not in a play, but a mask.

Whether the revels were kept at Westminster, Hampton Court, Greenwich, Richmond, or Windsor, sufficient accommodation could be afforded for a play in the great hall, which thus for a brief space resumed its ancient glories as the state apartment of the sovereign. At the first three of those palaces, there is definite evidence of the use of the hall. But Whitehall, at least, was spacious enough to offer other alternatives. The banqueting-house might be available, if it was not occupied by the preparations for a mask. And performances were sometimes given in the 'great chamber', which at Whitehall was distinct from both the presence chamber and the 'guard' or 'watching' chamber which served as an ante-room to the presence.[1] It seems also that provision could be made, perhaps only on the less public and crowded occasions when the King was not present, for a stage in the octagonal cockpit, which stood on the edge of St. James's Park, in the western extension of the palace.[2] As a courtesy to a royal visitor, a play was given in 1565 at the Savoy, where the Lady Cecilia of Sweden was housed, and in 1614 Anne's pastoral of *Hymen's Triumph* took place in 'a little square paved court' at Somerset House.

[1] Cf. also *M. N. D.* iii. 1. 57; *Isle of Gulls*, iii (ed. Bullen, p. 67), 'in the great Chamber at the Reuels'. The Elizabethan *Chamber Accounts* rarely show the room; in 1597–8 the hall at Hampton Court, in 1600–1 the hall and in 1601–2 the great chamber at Whitehall. I have examined only a few Jacobean ones on this point; the hall, great chamber, and banqueting-house, at Whitehall, were all used in 1604–5; the hall, banqueting-house, and cockpit in 1610–11; the banqueting-house twice in April 1612–13.

[2] Cf. App. B, *s.a.* 1608–12. On the Cockpit cf. Stowe, *Survey*, ii. 102, 374; Sheppard, *Whitehall*, 66; W. J. Lawrence in *E. S.* xxxv. 279; *L. T. R.* i. 38; ii. 23; vii. 49, 61; Adams, 384. I am not quite clear where the original pit stood. Stowe puts on the right hand as you go down Whitehall 'diuers fayre Tennis courtes, bowling allies, and a Cockepit, al built by King Henry the eight'. Wyngaerde and Agas show various buildings here, of which one in Agas is of pit shape. Faithorne's map of Westminster (1658), which is said to represent the locality at a much earlier date, shows, just south of the tilt-yard, a quadrangle divided off from the road by a low boundary wall, with buildings all round it and an angled building in the midst. This must I think be the Cockpit, and some of the buildings round it the lodgings which also bore that name and were occupied by the Princess Elizabeth before her marriage (Birch, *Charles I*, ii. 213) and by Lady Somerset in 1615 (*Rutland MSS.* i. 448). Here presumably provision for Cockpit was made for James in 1604 (cf. p. 53), and Henry and Elizabeth saw plays in 1608–13 (App. B). But I doubt whether this is the Cockpit shown in Fisher's Restoration plan of Whitehall and in an engraving, probably from a seventeenth-

It is a curious illustration of the functions of the Privy Council as a household board that, during the whole of Elizabeth's time and the greater part of that of James, the actors could not get their fee or 'reward', except through the medium of a formal warrant addressed by that body to the Treasurer of the Chamber. These warrants are not in existence, but their issue is noted, rather irregularly and inaccurately, in the collection of minutes known as the Council register, and they are recited, with their dates and places of signature, and the names of the actors or managers to whom they appointed payment to be made on behalf of the companies, in the annual accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber as audited and declared before the Exchequer.[1] The amount of the reward was, subject to certain historical developments, a uniform one. It had been fixed, early in the reign of Henry VIII, at ten marks (£6 13*s.* 4*d.*) a play, and this rate continued to rule, when Elizabeth came to the throne, and for some years thereafter. But in 1572 a tendency to an increase shows itself, and up to 1575 the amounts are irregular. Sometimes the normal fee is paid, sometimes a double fee of £13 6*s.* 8*d.*, sometimes an intermediate one of £10. The Treasurer of the Chamber records various explanations of the extra sums. They are 'a more rewarde by her maiesties owne comaundement', or they are paid in respect of special charges incurred by the companies, as for example when Farrant had to bring his boys from Windsor to Whitehall. And after 1575 things had evidently settled down on the basis of a normal £10, which was conventionally regarded as made up of £6 13*s.* 4*d.* 'for presentinge' the play, and £3 6*s.* 8*d.* 'by way of speciall reward'. The formulas in the accounts are not invariably the same, but they all come to this; and the shadowy distinction between the two amounts

century drawing, reproduced in *L. T. R.* ii. 23, and Adams, 407. This was square externally, and apparently stood farther west than Faithorne's from the line of the tilt-yard, at the extreme north-west angle of the palace buildings where they jutted into St. James's Park. I think Adams is clearly right in identifying this building with the little theatre a plan of which by Inigo Jones was published from a Worcester College MS. by H. Bell in *Architectural Record* (1913), 262 (cf. p. 234). Adams further identifies it with a 'new theatre at Whitehall' opened about 1632, no doubt to replace the old Cockpit. If so, Faithorne is clearly out of date. This later Cockpit was on the site of the present Treasury buildings, and the locality long continued to bear its name. Treasury letters were dated from the Cockpit, and the King's speech is said to have been rehearsed there as late as 1806. The passage leading from Whitehall to the Treasury is still called the Cockpit passage. A quite distinct cockpit near Birdcage Walk is marked by the extant Cockpit Steps. It existed by 1720 and was destroyed in 1816. Whether the angled building shown in this direction by Wyngaerde can represent it, or a predecessor, I do not know.

[1] Cf. App. B.

is preserved in the practice by which, if a play was ordered and then counter-ordered, the £6 13*s.* 4*d.* was paid, but not the £3 6*s.* 8*d.* The £10 rate was maintained, with insignificant exceptions, during the rest of Elizabeth's reign, and was taken over as 'the usuall allowaunce' or 'the ordinary rates formerly allowed' by James.[1] If, however, a play was ordered for the Prince only and not the King, the 'speciall rewarde' was omitted, so far as the Treasurer of the Chamber was concerned, although it is quite possible that the Prince may have supplied it out of his privy purse.[2] A quite exceptional amount of £30 was paid to the King's men for a play at Wilton in December 1603, to cover their 'paynes and expences' in coming from Mortlake to give the performance. Plague was raging, and they were probably practicing at Mortlake for the court entertainments of the following Christmas. It may be added that the King's company, and that alone, received a subsidy of £30 from the Treasurer of the Chamber, in aid of its maintenance during this plague-winter. Similar payments, of £40 and £30 respectively, were made after the plague-winters of 1608–9 and 1609–10.[3]

In 1614 there was an innovation in the procedure, by which the responsibility for signing warrants for allowances to players was transferred from the Privy Council to the Lord Chamberlain; and thenceforward the payments are recorded

[1] There may have been special reasons why the Chapel only got £15 for two plays in 1583–4, Oxford's £6 13*s.* 4*d.* for a play in 1584–5, the Queen's £20 for three plays in 1587–8, and the Chapel £5 for a 'showe' in 1600–1. The accounts for 1605–6 seem to point to an unsuccessful attempt to establish a flat rate of £5 for a 'rewarde' and £3 6*s.* 8*d.* for a 'more rewarde', for plays before James and Henry alike. The payments of 17 May 1615 of £43 0*s.* 8*d.* for six plays before 'his highnes' (which in these accounts generally means the Prince) perhaps really represent one play before James and five before Charles.

[2] Henry's accounts for 1610–12 (Cunningham, xiii) include payments for making ready the Cockpit for plays, and rewards to musicians and a juggler, but none for players; but Elizabeth lost a play in a wager in 1612, and Anne paid for two plays at Somerset House in 1615. The only play recorded by the Treasurer of the Chamber as specially before Anne (10 Dec. 1604) was paid for at £10. Naturally she was present at plays entered as before the King or Prince, and in 1612 plays paid for at the King's rate seem in fact to have been shown before Anne and Henry in his absence (cf. App. B).

[3] The £10 fee continued to be paid under Charles I, but by 1630–1 the players had established a claim to an additional £10 if their service at court lost them a day at the theatre, owing to a journey to Hampton Court or Richmond or an occasional performance or rehearsal at Whitehall in the day-time. During 1636–7, however, the theatres were closed for plague (*M. S. C.* i. 301), and the King's men had an allowance of £20 a week to maintain them near the court (*S. P. D. Car. I*, cccxxxvii. 33), and did not get the extra £10 a play; cf. E. Law, *More about Shakespeare Forgeries*, 37, and the extracts from the *Lord Chamberlain's Records* in C. C. Stopes, *Shakespeare's Fellows and Followers* (*Jahrbuch*, xlvi. 92).

in a special section of the Treasurer's accounts, devoted to expenditure which the Chamberlain had power to authorize, and most of which had been at one time charged to the Privy Purse.[1] An example from a later date of a Lord Chamberlain's warrant for payment is preserved, together with a schedule of the plays covered by the amount paid. The warrant refers to the 'acquittance for the receipt' of the money, which the Treasurer would take from the players, and is in fact endorsed with receipts by one of them for the successive instalments paid, and with a final one for the whole sum due.[2] References in the *Chamber Accounts* for 1605–6 and 1609–10 to similar schedules in or annexed to the warrants show that, at an earlier date, the Privy Council had evidence before them, perhaps from the Lord Chamberlain, perhaps from the Master of the Revels, as to the number of plays which a company had given.[3] It is a pity that the Treasurer of the Chamber only on rare occasions thought it worth while to record the name of the play for which he was paying. A chance memorandum of Henslowe's tells us that, as perhaps we might have guessed, some of the money stuck to the hands of officials in the form of fees. To get the £10 due to Worcester's men for a play in 1601–2, Henslowe had had to give the Clerk of the Council 7*s.* for 'geatynge the cownselles handes to' the warrant, and 10*s.* 6*d.* 'for fese' to one Mr. Moysse 'at the receuinge of the mony owt of the payhowsse'.[4] On the other hand, the players got their money pretty quickly; the warrants were generally signed within a month or so, sometimes within a day or so, of the performances to which they relate. Considerable delays during the years 1596–9 possibly reflect the disorganization of the Revels Office by the disputes of the officers; just as similar delays about 1615–17 probably reflect the general disorganization of Jacobean finance.

Plays were given in private houses, as well as at court, and

[1] Cf. ch. ii, p. 66.

[2] The documents are printed by Cunningham, xxiv, and by Law, *More*, 39, 71, who gives the warrant more fully. They were removed by Cunningham from the Audit Office, and when returned to the Record Office were classed in error as papers subsidiary to the Revels Accounts, instead of to those of the Treasurer of the Chamber. But Law, *More*, 61, successfully vindicates their authenticity, and I may add that the dockets of Chamberlain's warrants for other years (*Jahrbuch*, xlvi. 94) refer to schedules now lost, and that a schedule of the plays of the King's men for 1638–9 was facsimiled from a private manuscript by G. R. Wright in *Brit. Arch. Ass. Journal*, xvi. 275, 344 (1860), and in his *Archaeologic and Historic Fragments* (1887). In this the claims for 'our day lost' are clearly specified.

[3] The schedule attached to a warrant of 1633 (*Jahrbuch*, xlvi. 97) appears to have been a bill signed by the Master of the Revels.

[4] Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, 109; but his note is a slip.

not only when there was a royal guest to be entertained. As the public theatres were open by daylight, the companies were easily available for private engagements after supper. Naturally the record of such occasions has in most cases perished with the domestic account-books in which it was entered. But Sir Edward Hoby invited Sir Robert Cecil to a performance of *Richard II*—at least, I think so—in 1595.[1] The gossip of Rowland Whyte informs us of the banquets and plays given in honour of Sir Robert Cecil by Sir Walter Raleigh and other friends on the eve of his mission to France in 1598, of the two plays at a supper about the same date by Sir Gilly Meyrick at the rival political head-quarters of Essex House, and of the performances of *Henry IV* under its original title of *Sir John Oldcastle*, when Lord Chamberlain Hunsdon feasted the Flemish ambassador Louis Verreyken in 1600.[2] Similarly, in 1606 John Chamberlain went to a play at Sir Walter Cope's, now Holland House, and 'had to squire his daughter about, till he was weary', and in 1613 Sir Robert Rich had a play for the delectation of the Savoyard ambassador after a supper in Holborn.[3] An amusing side-light on the improvised stage-arrangements necessary in private houses is given by a stage-direction in Percy's *Aphrodysial*, 'Here went furth the whole Chorus in a shuffle as after a Play in a Lord's howse'.[4] Wealthy citizens, if they were not too puritanically disposed, could well afford to follow the lead of the nobles and gentry of the court. And in the years before the controversy between

[1] Cf. ch. xiii (Chamberlain's).

[2] *Sydney Papers*, ii. 86 (30 Jan. 1598), 'My Lord Compton, my Lord Cobham, Sir Walter Rawley, my Lord Southampton, doe severally feast Mr. Secretary before he depart, and have plaies and banquets. My Lady Darby, my Lady Walsingham, Mrs. Anne Russell, are of the company, and my Lady Rawley'; ii. 90 (15 Feb. 1598), 'Sir Gilley Meiricke made at Essex House yesternight a very great supper. There were at yt, my Ladys Lester, Northumberland, Bedford, Essex, Rich; and my Lordes of Essex, Rutland, Monjoy, and others. They had 2 plaies, which kept them up till 1 a clocke after midnight'; ii. 175 (8 March 1600), 'All this Weeke the Lords haue bene in London, and past away the Tyme in Feasting and Plaies; for Vereiken dined vpon Wednesday, with my Lord Treasurer, who made hym a Roiall Dinner; vpon Thursday my Lord Chamberlain feasted hym, and made hym very great, and a delicate Dinner, and there in the After Noone his Plaiers acted, before Vereiken, Sir John Old Castell, to his Great Contentment'. It seems that, for their patron, the Chamberlain's men would give up an afternoon.

[3] *S. P. D. Jac. I*, xix. 12 (1606); Birch, i. 243; Winwood, iii. 461. A gallant might also have his private play at night in a tavern; cf. Nashe, *Lenten Stuffe* (1599, *Works*, iii. 148), 'To London againe he will, to reuell it, and haue two playes in one night, inuite all the Poets and Musitions to his chamber the next morning'; *A Mad World, my Masters*, v. i. 78, 'a right Mitre supper;—a play and all'.

[4] *Aphrodysial*, v. 5, cited by Reynolds, *Percy*, 258.

the corporation and the actors became acute, a play was thought no inappropriate accompaniment to the annual feast of a guild, or the welcome or valediction of a civic dignitary.[1] The domestic plays of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges had their origin in the Renaissance theories of education, and dispensed with the professional mimes. A detailed study of them lies outside the scope of these volumes.[2] The Inns of Court men, too, could hold their own upon the boards at will. But for their ordinary solace they were accustomed to take the easier course of calling in professional aid. At the Inner Temple, Beaumont mentions a Christmas show of Lady Amity, probably not long after his admission in 1600, and the Treasurer's accounts of the Inner Temple, which are extant from 1605, show that from that year to 1611 there was always a play, at a cost of £5, either upon Candlemas or upon All Saints' Day, and in some years on both dates. At Candlemas 1611, something must have gone wrong, for on February 10 the Benchers passed a decree:

'For that great disorder and scurrility is brought into this House by lewd and lascivious plays, it is likewise ordered in this parliament that from henceforth there shall be no more plays in this House, either upon the feast of All Saints or Candlemas day, but the same from henceforth to be utterly taken away and abolished.'

At the following feast of All Saints the only expenditure entered by the Treasurer is of £2 10*s.* for a 'consort' of music and £2 for antics and puppets. These must have proved but inadequate substitutes, for on November 24 the period of austerity was brought to an end by the withdrawal of the interdict.

'Whereas of late years upon the two festival days of All Saints and Candlemas, plays have been used after dinner for recreation which have lately been laid down by order in parliament, it is now ordered that the same order shall henceforth stand repealed.'

The payments are now resumed, and continue twice a year, generally at the increased rate of £6 13*s.* 4*d.* At Candlemas 1613 some misunderstanding seems to have led to a supple-

[1] Machyn, 222, 290, notes a play, either in the Guildhall or in that of the Lord Mayor's company, on 6 Jan. 1560, and a play at the Barber Surgeons' feast on 10 Aug. 1562. The Pewterers collected 'playe pence' at their 'yemandrie feast' about 1563 (C. Welch, *Pewterers*, i. 233). Recorder Fleetwood saw a play at a dinner with the outgoing sheriffs on 29 Sept. 1575 (*Hatfield MSS.* ii. 116; dated 1573 in error in Murdin, ii. 259, and Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 357).

[2] They are fully treated for the sixteenth century by F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914), and more briefly for the whole period, with a valuable bibliography, by the same writer, in *C. H.* vi. 293. I have recorded the extant plays, English and Latin, in App. K.

mentary payment to 'another company of players which were appointed to play the same day'. On All Saints 1614 and both Candlemas and All Saints 1615, the players are specified to have been the King's men.[1] From the other Inns the story is more fragmentary. The devices for the famous Gray's Inn Christmas of 1594–5, reported in the *Gesta Grayorum*, were mainly due to the fertile imagination of the lawyers themselves. In addition to the continuous burlesque of state ceremonies in the court of Purpoole and the mask sent to Whitehall at Shrovetide, they included a special show of Amity for the reception of the ambassador of Templaria on January 3. But this had its origin in the disorders of an earlier revel on Innocents' Day, when the confusion was so great that the Inner Temple men left in dudgeon, and the show then intended was not given. To supply its place, 'a Comedy of Errors (like to *Plautus* his *Menechmus*) was played by the players. So that night was begun, and continued to the end, in nothing but Confusion and Errors; whereupon, it was ever afterwards called, *The Night of Errors*.' On the following day there was a trial, and a supposed sorcerer or conjurer was arraigned on the charge amongst others 'that he had foisted a Company of base and common Fellows, to make up our Disorders with a Play of Errors and Confusions'.[2] Similarly the Middle Temple in 1597–8 varied their own fooling with plays on 28 December and 2 January, which from the absence of details in the narrative were probably supplied by professional actors.[3] And this house, too, must have been accustomed to keep Candlemas with a play, for a note of February 1602 in John Manningham's diary makes mention of *Twelfth Night* as given 'at our feast'.[4] The same practice, known as the Post Revels, prevailed at Lincoln's Inn. Here the notices are of an earlier date, and preserve the memory

[1] Ch. xxiii, s.v. Beaumont; Inderwick, *Inner Temple Records*, i. lxv, 219; ii. xlix, 23 *sqq.*, 56, 64. A payment of 20*s.* 'to the players' at the Christmas of 1615 was probably, in view of the amount, for musicians. The earlier account-books are not preserved. On the plays, not necessarily professional, of the 1561–2 Christmas, cf. ch. xxiii, s.v. Brooke.

[2] *Gesta Grayorum* (M. S. R.), 22, 23. R. J. Fletcher, *The Pension Book of Gray's Inn* (1901), prints entries of payments for 'the play at Shrovetyde' 1581, of which nothing more is known, and 'the play in Michaelmas terme' and 'the Tragedie' in 1587–8, in which year the Inn gave *Catiline* at home before Lord Burghley on 16 Jan. (*M. S. C.* i. 179) and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* at court on 28 Feb. Gascoigne's *Supposes* and *Jocasta* were both produced at Gray's Inn in 1566–7. The Inn was to have entertained the Duke of Bracciano with 'shewes' at Christmas 1600–1, but he left too soon (Chamberlain, 99; Camden (tr.), 535).

[3] B. Rudyerd, *Memoirs*, 12, 13. The ascription of these revels to 'the Christmas of 1599' in *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 416, is an error; cf. p. 169.

[4] Manningham, 18.

of performances by the Chapel boys in 1565, 1566, and 1580, and by Lord Roche's, or more probably Lord Rich's, men in 1570.[1]

I have digressed somewhat from the ways of the court. The arrangements for performances were in the hands of the Revels, and are therefore only traceable in detail before 1589, after which year the extant accounts of that office are very summary. As Christmas drew near, symptoms of bustle began to show themselves in the work-rooms. A good deal of time was spent in the discovery and preparation of suitable pieces. It would seem that the available companies were invited to submit the various plays in which they had exercised themselves by public performance, that these were then recited, and a selection made from them to the number which her majesty intended to hear.[2] Both in 1574–5 and in 1576–7 the accounts record the trying over of plays that were not ultimately given. These 'rehearsals' or 'proofs' took place in the hall or the 'great chamber' of St. John's, or the Master's lodgings, and were of an elaborate character, for it was thought worth while to bring in cumbrous properties

[1] J. D. Walker, *Black Books of Lincoln's Inn*, i. xxxiii, 344, 348, 352, 362, 374, 418; ii. 55. It was ordered on 2 Feb. 1565 that 'M^r Edwards shall have in reward liij^s, iiij^d for his plee, and his hussher x^s, and x^s more to the children that pleed' (in margin, 'Children of the Quenes Chappell'). The accounts of 1564–5, however, show £1 18*s.* 2*d.* for a supper and for staff torches, clubs, and other necessaries for the play, and £1 as reward for the boys; those of 1565–6 £2 to the boys of the Queen's chapel and their master for a play at the Purification; those of 1569–70 £1 'lusoribus' of 'Lord Roche' at the Purification; those of 1579–80 £3 6*s.* 8*d.* on 9 Feb. 'to M^r Ferrand [Farrant] one of the Queen's chaplains *pro commedia*'. On 12 May 1598, a levy was made for the expenses of 'the gentlemen that were actors in the matter of the shew the last Christmas'. No more is known of this show. On the Inns of Court Christmases generally cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 413.

[2] The Westminster accounts of 1564–5 (Murray, ii. 168) include 'at y^e rehersing before Sir Thomas Benger for pinnes and sugar candee vi^d' and 'the second tyme att the playing of Heautonti. for pinnes halfe a thousand vi^d', but there is nothing to suggest that any play but *Miles Gloriosus* was given before the Queen. The *Revels Accounts* (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 145, 176, 179, 238, 277, 325, &c.) have (1571–2), 'playes . . . chosen owte of many and ffownde to be the best that then were to be had, the same also being often pervsed, & necessarely corrected & amended (by all thafforesaide officers)'; (1572–3), 'muzitians that plaide at the proof of Duttons play' . . . 'rushes in the hall & in the greate chambere where the workes were doone & the playes rezited'; (1574–5) 'at Wynsor . . . for peruzing and reformyng of Farrantes playe' . . . 'wheare my Lord of Leicesters menne showed theier matter of Panecia' . . . 'where my Lord Clyntons players rehearsed a matter called Pretestus', &c.; (1576–7), 'To Whitehall and back againe to recyte before my Lord Chamberleyn' . . . 'to S^t Johns . . . for the play of Cutwell'; (1579–80) 'Thinges . . . brought into the Masters Lodginge for the rehearsall of sondrie playes to make choise of dyvers of them for her maiestie', &c., &c.

for them and to employ musicians. When the selection had been made, further rehearsals were required, especially as the texts had to undergo a process of 'reforming' or editing, in order that they might be 'convenient' for her majesty's hearing. There had been a bad blunder at the second Christmas of the reign when 'the plaers plad shuche matter that they wher commondyd to leyff off'.[1] Sometimes the office called in special aid to make such alterations; sometimes, as we learn from Henslowe's diary, the companies employed their own poets to carry them out, or to write special prologues or epilogues.[2] At first the perusal of plays appears to have been a common responsibility of the officers.[3] While Blagrave was in charge, it was supervised by the Lord Chamberlain, for whose satisfaction rehearsals sometimes took place at court. Tilney was encouraged by his commission of 1581 to treat it as his personal function, and charged wages for attendance at the office, with a porter and three other servitors, but as a rule without his colleagues, on nearly every day between All Saints and Christmas for the purpose of carrying it out.[4] All the officers, on the other hand, were concerned with the provision of the fittings of the stage and the properties and apparel necessary to furnish a sumptuous appearance for the players. The details of this provision are so mixed up in the accounts with those for the masks that they can only occasionally be assigned to individual plays. The wording of certain entries suggests that, while some plays required a complete outfit, for others the Revels was only called upon to supplement what the companies already possessed.[5] Probably the stuffs employed

[1] Machyn, 221.

[2] Cf. chh. xxiii, xxiv, s.vv. Chettle (1602); Dekker, *Fortunatus, Phaethon*; the anonymous *Histriomastix*. The prints of several plays contain special court prologues or epilogues, e.g. Lyly's *Campaspe* and *Sapho and Phaon*.

[3] Buggin's Revels memorandum of 1573 (*Tudor Revels*, 33) indicates that his proposed Serjeant 'is with the master and the reast of the officers to be at the rehersall of playes'.

[4] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 326 (1579–80, 50 days), 337 (1580–1, 70 days), table ii (1581–2, 44 days), 352 (1582–3, 62 days), table iii (1583–4, 56 days), 368 (1584–5, 66 days), 389 (1587–8, 64 days; 1588–9, 57 days). The commission (App. D, No. lvi) authorized the Master to command players 'to appear before him with all suche plaies tragedies comedies or showes as they shall haue in readines or meane to sett forth and them to presente and recite before our said servant or his sufficient deputie'.

[5] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 145, 193, 286, 320. In 1571–2 all the plays were 'throwghly apparelled and ffurnished'; in 1573–4 all were 'fytted and ffurnyshed with the store of thoffice and with the woorkmanshipp and provisions herein expressed'; in 1578–9 the clerk seems to distinguish between plays furnished with 'sondrey', 'some', 'manie', and 'verie manie' things; in 1579–80 seven out of nine plays were 'wholie furnyshed

were less expensive than those lavished on the masks. Certain articles, such as armour, were generally hired. Elaborate properties, which might entail the designing of special 'patterns', had often to be constructed. The fixed 'composition' of £66 6*s.* 8*d.* for all the ordinary charges of plays imposed upon the office in 1598 cannot have left much margin for apparel and properties.[1] But probably by this date the companies were themselves better equipped.

When the actual night of performance arrived, all the officers gave personal attendance at Court. Here they had, in Tilney's time, until they were crowded out and driven to hire for themselves, an office and a chamber for the Master, both of which they kept supplied with fuel and rushes.[2] They had also to superintend the conveyance of the 'stuff', either by wagon or by barge and tiltboat, to fit the players with the gloves which seem to have been *de rigueur* at a Court performance, and to furnish such amenities of the tiring-house as 'an iron cradle to make fire in' and a close-stool.[3] With the officers came a doorkeeper and three servitors, who probably acted as dressers.[4] As the court performances were always at night, beginning about 10 p.m. and ending about 1 a.m., the arrangements for lighting were a constant preoccupation.[5] From the wire-drawers' bills incorporated in the accounts we can gather that use was made of candlesticks of various kinds and sizes, of lanterns, and of branches large and small. Candelabra were formed of as many as twenty-four branches, each bearing four lights, and hung upon wires strained across the hall.[6] But here again the precise provision made for plays cannot be disentangled from that made for masks. There is no special reference to footlights.

Except for the lighting and the maintenance of a 'music-house', the situation of which is unknown, the functions of the Revels do not appear to have extended beyond the

in this offyce', and of the others one had 'sondrie' and one 'many' things; cf. Graves, 83.

[1] Cf. ch. iii, p. 93.

[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 354, 370, 381, 391; cf. ch. iii, p. 89.

[3] Ibid. 140, 174, 236, 320, 336, 349 (gloves); 338 (cradle); 205 (close-stool). The Westminster boys in 1565 found their own 'sugar candee', 'comfetts', and 'butterd beere for y^e^ children being horse' (Murray, ii. 168).

[4] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 337.

[5] Tarlton, 10, records a jest, 'Tarlton having plaied before the queen till one a clock at midnight'. De Silva describes entertainments of Elizabeth in private houses early in the reign which ended at 1.30 and 2 a.m. (ch. v, pp. 161, 162). Under James, a play on 7 Jan. 1610, began at 10 p.m. (*Arch.* xii. 268).

[6] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 159, 202, 216, 300, 353, 368, &c. We hear of 'high', 'vice', 'stock', 'pricke', 'plate', and 'hand' candlesticks.

tiring-house and the decorative enrichment of the stage.[1] The fabric, both of the stage and of the seating for spectators, was a matter for the Works.[2] The 'apparelling' of the room was under the supervision of the Gentleman Usher of the Chamber, and in the marshalling of the audience the Lord Chamberlain could count on the assistance of the 'white staves' of the Household, and of the few officers who still survived from the once important office of the Hall.[3] No picture or detailed description of the auditorium survives.[4] A brief notice of 1594 shows us Elizabeth conspicuous 'in a high throne, richly adorned', and next to her chair the Earl of Essex, 'with whom she often devised in sweet and favourable manner'.[5] This high throne was no doubt the 'state', which was brought into the action of *The Arraignment of Paris*. Something more may be gleaned from the narratives of royal visits to the universities. That to Cambridge in 1564, indeed, affords no very close analogy, for the structure of the stage was of quite an abnormal type.[6] It was not in a hall, but in the chapel of King's College, and

[1] Cunningham, 214 (1611–12), 'For a musik house dore in the hall and a doore for the musik house in the Bancketing house with lockes'; possibly that in the hall was used for plays rather than masks.

[2] Cf. App. B and the Works Account of 'Chardges done for the revells in the hall' at Shrovetide 1568 in Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 120. But the Revels themselves had 'to enlardge the scaffolde in the hall' in 1579–80 (327).

[3] Cf. ch. ii, p. 34.

[4] On the woodcut in *Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (1590), cf. *Bibl. Note* to ch. xviii.

[5] Cf. App. A.

[6] Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii. 267 (from account of Matthew Stokys in *Harl. MS.* 7037 (*Baker MS.* 10)): 'For the hearing and playing whereof was made, by her highness surveyor and at her own cost, in the body of the church, a great stage containing the breadth of the church from the one side to the other, that the chapels might serve for houses. In the length it ran two of the lower chapels full, with the pillars on a side. Upon the south wall was hanged a cloth of state, with the appurtenances and half path, for her majesty. In the rood loft, another stage for ladies and gentlewomen to stand on. And the two lower tables, under the said rood loft, were greatly enlarged and railed for the choice officers of the court. There was, before her majesty's coming, made in the King's College hall, a great stage. But, because it was judged by divers to be too little, and too close for her highness and her company, and also far from her lodging, it was taken down. When all things were ready for the plays, the Lord Chamberlain with Mr. Secretary came in, bringing a multitude of the guard with them, having every man in his hand a torch-staff for the lights of the play (for no other lights were occupied) and would not suffer any to stand upon the stage, save a very few upon the north side. And the guard stood upon the ground by the stage side, holding their lights. From the quire door unto the stage was made as 'twere a bridge, railed on both sides, for the queen's grace to go to the stage; which was straitly kept.' This account is also in Nichols, *Eliz.* i. 151. In his first edition Nichols (iii. 27) also gave an account by Nicholas Robinson, which adds the detail that the stage was 'structura quaedam ex crassioribus asseribus altitudine pedum quinque'; cf. also Boas, 91.

was built five feet high right across the nave from wall to wall. The 'state' for the Queen was placed on the stage itself, against the south wall. She reached it by a bridge from the choir door. At the other end of the stage, under the north wall, stood the actors, with two side chapels to serve for their entrances and exits. Cecil and Dudley, as Chancellor and High Steward of the University, 'vouchsafed to hold both books on the scaffold themselves, and to provide that sylence might be kept with quietness'. I am not quite clear whether these books were prompt-books, or copies of the texts, provided in order that the Queen or her train, if they thought fit, might help out their Latinity. When the Westminster boys brought the *Miles Gloriosus* to Court in 1565, they spent 11*s.* on 'one Plautus geuen to the Queenes maiestie and fowre other unto the nobilitie', and the *Sapientia Salomonis* which they gave Elizabeth in 1565–6 is still extant.[1] Only a few other privileged spectators were allowed on the King's College stage, at the north end. Seats were provided for ladies and gentlemen in the rood loft, and for the chief officers of the Court at 'the twoe loer Tables' below the rood loft. The only lighting was provided by the torches of the guard, who were aligned along the sides of the stage. At Oxford, on the other hand, where the plays were given in Christ Church hall, it is reasonable to assume that the arrangements were directly modelled upon those prevalent in the palaces.[2] There was, however, one exceptional feature, due to the desire to enable the Queen to reach the hall, without being incommoded by the press of spectators. A temporary

[1] Cf. ch. xii and App. K.

[2] Plummer, 123 (from Bereblock's account): 'Primo ibi ab ingenti solido pariete patefacto aditu proscenium insigne fuit, ponsque ab eo ligneus pensilis, sublicis impositus, parvo et perpolito tractu per transversos gradus ad magnam Collegii aulam protrahitur; festa fronde coelato pictoque umbraculo exornatur, ut per eum, sine motu et perturbatione prementis vulgi, regina posset, quasi aequabili gressu, ad praeparata spectacula contendere. Erat aula laqueari aurato, et picto arcuatoque introrsus tecto, granditate ac superbia sua veteris Romani palatii amplitudinem, et magnificentia imaginem antiquitatis diceres imitari. Parte illius superiori, qua occidentem respicit, theatrum excitatur magnum et erectum, gradibusque multis excelsum Iuxta omnes parietes podia et pegmata extructa sunt, subsellia eisdem superiora fuerunt multorum fastigiorum, unde viri illustres ac matronae suspicerentur, et populus circumcirca ludos prospicere potuit. Lucernae, lichni, candelaeque ardentes clarissimam ibi lucem fecerunt. Tot luminaribus, ramulis ac orbibus divisis, totque passim funalibus, inaequali splendore, incertam praebentibus lucem, splendebat locus, ut et instar diei micare, et spectaculorum claritatem adiuvare candore summo visa sint. Ex utroque scenae latere comoedis ac personatis magnifica palatia, aedesque apparatissimae extruuntur. Sublime fixa sella fuit, pulvinaribus ac tapetiis ornata, aureoque umbraculo operta, Reginae destinatus locus erat'; cf. Boas, 99.

door was cut in the side of the hall and a 'proscenium' or 'porch' built in front of it, which was approached by a wooden 'bridge' or stairway, adorned with a painted roof and hung with greenery.[1] It was a wise precaution, for undergraduates were not excluded, as they had been at Cambridge, and the press on the main staircase of the hall was so great that one of the low bounding walls was broken down and killed a college cook and two other persons.[2] The interior appearance of the hall is fully described by Bereblock. The stage was at the upper or western end, raised high above a flight of steps. The Queen had a high seat beneath a gilded state, the exact location of which is not specified. The lords and ladies were accommodated on scaffolds round the walls, and the lesser personages in galleries above them. Every kind of lighting device seems to have been utilized, including 'ramuli' and 'orbes', in which we may see the 'branches' and 'plates' of the Revels Accounts. The Christ Church hall, with a stage at its upper end, was used again when James came in 1605, and we hear of a dispute between the academic functionaries and those of the Household as to the placing of the King's chair. The latter complained that it was fixed so low that only His Majesty's cheek would be visible to the auditory; the latter attempted to explain that, by the laws of perspective, the King would have a much better view than if he sat higher. There was a solemn debate in the council chamber, resulting in the decision that a King must not merely see, but be seen, and the state was moved to the middle of the hall, twenty-eight feet from the stage, which in fact proved too far, as he could not well hear or understand the long speeches. The Queen and Prince shared the state with the King; in front, but on a lower level, were seats for ladies; the state itself was ringed with lights; on either side were placed nobles; and the populace thronged around the walls.[3]

I think it may be taken that this seating, with the sovereign in the middle of the floor and directly opposite the stage, was that ordinarily employed. It may be illustrated by a French engraving of Louis XIII in Richelieu's Palais Royal theatre of the mid-seventeenth century, which also shows very clearly the seating round the walls and the lighting by means of suspended chandeliers.[4] I notice that Mr. Ernest Law,

[1] I think Feuillerat, *M. P.* 73, must be misled by the Cambridge analogy and the use of the term 'proscenium' in supposing the 'pons' to have been within the auditorium and the state on the stage. The 'proscenium' was doubtless the 'porch' taken down after the visit (Boas, 106). The exterior of the hall has been refaced since 1566, but Dr. Boas tells me that during some recent alterations an unexplained aperture was traceable from within.

[2] Cf. ch. iv.

[3] Cf. p. 234.

[4] Jusserand, *Shakespeare in France* (tr.), 93, pl. xi.

in tracing the outlines of the vanished hall of Whitehall, places the stage at the lower or screen end of the building, and suggests that the pantry was utilized as a tiring-room.[1] He may have evidence as to this in reserve; but the Christ Church analogy, for what it is worth, points to a stage at the upper or daïs end. The Revels Accounts contain many items bearing upon the scenic decoration of the plays; but, as they were compiled, unfortunately, to satisfy the financial appetite of contemporary auditors, rather than to elucidate the archaeological problems of posterity, they not unnaturally take for granted a familiarity with the general system of that decoration which we do not happen to possess. The discussion of the problems, which cannot be dissociated from those presented by the public theatres, must be left for treatment, with the aid of the evidences furnished by plays themselves, in a later chapter.[2] But the actual information furnished by the accounts may conveniently be summarized at this point. The outstanding features were evidently certain 'houses', appropriate to the action of the plays, and specially prepared, with considerable trouble and expense, for each production, although no doubt the Revels officers, as in the case of masking garments, exercised their economical ingenuity where possible in the 'translation' of old material.[3] These houses appear to have been structures in relief, presumably practicable for entrances and exits, and perhaps also on occasion for interior action. Wooden frameworks, fitted with hooped tops, were covered with painted cloths of canvas, which was strained on with nails or pins, and was sometimes fringed.[4] From the amount of canvas

[1] *L. T. R.* vii. 41. In *The Times* for 3 Dec. 1917 Mr. Law has a similar reconstruction of the arrangements at Hampton Court, wherein he assigns the stage to a point before the screens, with the gallery over the screens for 'upper chamber scenes', rooms behind the screens for tiring-houses, and a players' supper room, and the Watching Chamber for rehearsals. But again he produces no evidence. [2] Cf. ch. xix.

[3] The expenses of 1578–9 (*vide infra*) included the 'mending' of houses. But I agree, broadly, with the argument of Graves, 53, that scenery for a Court performance had to be either new or renewed.

[4] In 1563–5, 'canvas to couer diuers townes and howsses and other devisses and clowds' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 116); in 1571–2, 'sundry Tragedies Playes Maskes and sportes with their apte howses of paynted canvas' (129); in 1572–3, 'sparres to make frames for the players howses' (175); in 1573–4, 'hoopes for tharbour and topp of an howse' . . . 'pynnes styf and great for paynted clothes' . . . 'nayles to strayne the canvas' . . . 'canvas to paynte for howses for the players and for other properties as monsters, greate hollow trees and suche other' . . . 'cariage for the fframes for the howses that served in the playes' . . . 'iij elme boordes and vij ledges for the frames for the players' . . . 'cariage of fframes and painted clothes for the players howses' (197, 201, 203, 204, 218); in 1574–5, 'canvas to make frenge for the players howse' (244); in

used, it may be judged that they were of considerable size.[1] The painting of the cloths was a matter of skilled workmanship. William Lyzarde, with thirty assistants, was employed upon it in 1571.[2] In 1572–3 'patternes' were prepared for the play of *Fortune*.[3] In most of the earlier accounts the houses are only mentioned incidentally and generically. But in 1567–8 they are stated to have consisted of 'Stratoes howse, Gobbyns howse, Orestioes howse, Rome, the Pallace of Prosperitie, Scotland and a gret Castell one thothere side'.[4] And when Edmund Tilney became Master of the Revels in 1579, he introduced, perhaps under pressure from the auditors, a practice, which lasted for some years, of including in the preliminary schedule of plays, with which his accounts began, a note of the specific houses constructed for each. Thus in 1579–80, there were a country house and a city for *The Duke of Milan and the Marquis of Mantua*, a city and a battlement for *Alucius*, a city and a mount for *The Four Sons of Fabius*, a city and a battlement for *Scipio Africanus*, a city and a country house for an unnamed play, a city and a town for *Portio and Demorantes*, a city for a play on the Soldan and a duke, and a great city, a wood, and a castle for *Serpedon*.[5] In 1580–1 there were a city and a battlement for *Delight*, a great city and a senate house for *Pompey*, a city and a battlement for each of two unnamed plays, a house and a battlement for a third, a city and a palace for a fourth, and a great city for a fifth.[6] In 1582–3 there were four pavilions for *A Game of the Cards*, a cloth and a battlement of canvas for *Beauty and Housewifery*, and a city and a battlement of canvas for each of four other plays.[7] In 1584–5 there were a great curtain, a mountain, and a great cloth of canvas for *Phillida and Corin*, a battlement and a house of canvas for *Felix and Philiomena*, a great cloth and a battlement, well, and mount of canvas for *Five Plays in One*, a house and a battlement for *Three Plays in One*, and a house for an unnamed play.[8] It is evident that decorative variety was sought after. Even when several successive plays could be fitted into the normal scheme of a city and a battlement, the stage architects had to prepare a separate device for each.

1576–7, 'cariadge . . . of a paynted cloth and two frames' (266); in 1587–9, 'timber bordes and workmanshipp in mending and setting vp of the houses by greate' (390); in 1587–8 'paynters for . . . clothe for howses' (381); in 1579–80, 'ffurre poles to make rayles for the battlementes and to make the prison for my Lord of Warwickes men' (327).

[1] Feuillerat, *M. P.* 69, calculates that enough cloth was painted in 1580–1, 1582–3, and 1584–5 to allow of about 16 square yards for every house or other *décor* used.

[2] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 134.

[3] Ibid. 176.

[4] Ibid. 119.

[5] Ibid. 320.

[6] Ibid. 336.

[7] Ibid. 349.

[8] Ibid. 365.

I think that when the Elizabethans spoke of 'houses' on the stage, they were perhaps regarding them primarily as the habitations of the actors rather than of the personages whom these represented. They were the tiring-houses, in which the actors remained when they were not in action and to and from which they made their exits and their entrances. At any rate, the term in its technical use seems wide enough to cover, not merely the palaces and the more humble domestic edifices which made appropriate backgrounds to the comings and goings of individual kings and citizens—of an Orestes, a Dobbyn—but also more elaborate and composite structures of 'battlements' and 'cities', of which the former doubtless represented the external view of the walls and gates of a town or castle, and the latter some internal town scene, a street or market-place, perhaps before the doors of more than one house in the narrower sense. We hear of such specialized forms of 'house' as 'pavilions' or tents, the 'Senat howse' used for *Quintus Fabius* in 1573–4 and the 'prison' which must have formed part of the 'cittie' for *The Four Sons of Fabius* in 1579–80. These, and probably other houses, were no doubt sufficiently practicable for personages to be seen, and in some cases also heard, inside them; and the senate house was veiled by curtains, which doubtless remained closed until the proper moment for interior action to take place. There are other references to curtains, the mechanism by which they were drawn, and the sarcenet of which they were made.[1] It has been suggested that some of these were front curtains, but there is no reason, so far as the evidence in the Revels Accounts is concerned, why they should not all, like the senate house curtain, have been veils for individual 'houses', such as were used in masks, and had been used in the corresponding *domus* of miracle-plays. It is possible, although not certain, that some of the 'great cloths' provided may have been for hangings to the back and side walls of the stage, rather than for covering houses. There is no reason why these should not have been painted in perspective, but the extent to which, if at all, perspective was employed is one of the points on which we are most in the dark.[2] Subsidiary structures, hollow trees, arbours, gibbets, altars, wells, gave variety to the action, and helped out the decorative

[1] In 1571–2, 'curtyn ringes' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 140); in 1573–4, 'poles and shivers for draft of the curtins before the senat howse . . . curtyn ringes . . . edging the curtins with ffrenge . . . tape and corde for the same' (200); in 1576–7, 'a lyne to draw a curteyne' (275); in 1580–1, a purchase of 8 ells of orange taffeta double sarcenet at 10^{s} an ell for a curtain for a play (338); in 1584–5 'one greate curteyne' of sarcenet for *Phillyda and Corin* (365).

[2] Cf. ch. xix.

effect of the houses.[1] For these also timber frames and canvas served. The hollow tree was doubtless a feature of the wood scenes, in which the painter's art, whether in relief or in perspective, was supplemented by the natural foliage of holly and ivy.[2] Elaborate rocks, such as are familiar in the masks, were also constructed. That for *The Knight in the Burning Rock* in 1578–9 required much timber, carried a chair, and was reached by a scaling ladder. The effect of burning was produced by lighted *aqua vitae*.[3] I am not quite sure whether a cloud drawn up and down by a cord and pulleys in the same year belonged to this play or to a mask, but obviously there was much give and take between the methods of plays and masks.[4] Spectacular elements were freely introduced into plays. A 'monster' of hoops and canvas, with a man moving inside it, was as easy for the managers of a *Perseus and Andromeda* in 1572–3 as for those of a *Peter Pan* in our own day; and doubtless the character was equally popular.[5] Hounds' heads were 'mowlded' for the cynocephali in *The History of the Cenofalles* of 1576–7.[6] The mediaeval 'devices for hell, and hell mowthe' were still in vogue in 1571–2, and in the same year *Narcissus* was enlivened by thunder and lightning and by the sounds of a hunt which rang through the palace court-yard, and *Paris and Vienna* by a tourney and barriers, in which players mounted on hobby-horses contended for a 'christall sheelde'.[7]

[1] In 1572–3, 'an awlter for Theagines' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 175); in 1573–4, 'lathes for the hollo tree' . . . 'one baskett with iiij eares to hang Dylligence in the play of Perobia . . . a iebbett to hang vp Diligence' . . . 'hoopes for tharbour' (199, 200, 203); in 1578–9 'a rope, a pulley, a basket' (296); in 1584–5, a well for *Five Plays in One* (365). For Cutwell, rehearsed but not performed in 1576–7 (277), 'the partes of y^e well counterfeit' were brought from the Bell to St. John's.

[2] In 1572–3, 'a tree of holly for the Duttons playe . . . holly for the forest . . . tymber for the forest . . . provizion and cariage of trees and other things to the Coorte for a wildernesse in a playe' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 175, 180); in 1573–4, 'holly and ivye for the play of Predor' (203); in 1574–5, 'moss and styckes' and holly and ivy (239, 244).

[3] Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 306. There were rocks or mountains also in 1574–5, 1579–80, and 1584–5 (244, 320, 365).

[4] Ibid. 240. It was an old device. Graves, 27, quotes Palsgrave, *Acolastus* (1540), 'in stage-playes, when some god or some saynt made to appeare forth of a cloude: and succoureth the parties which seemed to be towardes some great danger, through the Soudans crueltie'.

[5] 'Andramedas picture' . . . 'Benbow for playing in the monster' . . 'canvas for a monster' . . . 'hoopes for the monster' (ibid. 175, 176, 181).

[6] Ibid. 265.

[7] Ibid. 140, 141. The 'hunters that made the crye after the fox (let loose in the Coorte) with their howndes, hornes, and hallowing' had already been a feature of Edwardes' *Palaemon and Arcite* at Oxford in 1566.

So far as minor properties and apparel are concerned, it is often difficult to distinguish the respective needs of masks and plays in the long lists of provisions which the Revels officers detail.[1]

Something may be gleaned, to eke out the rather tantalizing indications of the account-books, from the more descriptive accounts of performances at the universities. The process is legitimate, because the organization of such productions was largely in the hands of Revels and Works experts brought from London by the Lord Chamberlain, who would naturally employ or adapt the methods already found successful at the Court itself. But even the university writers take a good deal of contemporary knowledge for granted. Of the Cambridge visit in 1564 we learn no more than that two chapels before which the stage was set served for 'houses'; of the Oxford visit in 1566 that 'palatia' and 'aedes' were built up 'ex utroque scenae latere', and that a temple in a wood was staged for an out-of-doors episode; of the Oxford visit of 1592 nothing.[2] Greater detail is forthcoming in 1605. The chroniclers were interested by the experiments of 'one M^r. Jones, a great Traveller', the result of which was stupendous in the eyes of the Oxford Public Orator, although an envious spy from Cambridge declared that he 'performed very little to that which was expected'. The stage on this occasion was slightly raked, so that the actors as they entered appeared to be coming down hill. At the back was a false wall, with a space of five or six paces behind it, 'for their howses and receipt of the actors'. In this wall Jones had set revolving pillars or peripetasmata, obviously based on the triangular περίακτοι of Vitruvius, whereby 'with the help of other painted clothes', he was able to change the face of the scene twice in the course of each play. Thus in *Ajax Flagellifer* the scene successively represented first 'Troia et littus Sigaeum', then 'Sylvae et solitudines horrenda antra et furiarum domicilia', and finally 'Tentoriorum naviumque facies'. The machines which worked these changes were

[1] Feuillerat, *M. P.* 57, gives an excellent summary of the data in the Accounts, but his schedule of properties does not attempt to disentangle masks and plays. The latter were liberally supplied. The Italians at Reading and Windsor during the progress of 1574, for example, were furnished with 'golde lether for cronetes', 'shepherdes hookes', 'lamskynnes for shepperds', 'arrowes for nymphes', 'a syth for Saturne', 'iij devells cotes and heades and one olde mannes fries cote' (Feuillerat, *Eliz.* 227). Probably the apparel used on the stage was of less costly materials than that worn by lords and ladies in masks, but it was doubtless calculated to present the same glittering effect.

[2] Cf. p. 226, and Plummer (from Bereblock), 138, 'Fiunt igitur in silvis septa marmorea' with three altars.

painted ' motantibus quasi nubibus, ut eas, Sole Britannico statim ingressuro, aufugientes putares '.[1]

The changing stage of 1605 was obviously an advance from the Elizabethan methods of twenty years before. But it can hardly be assumed that the new principles were regularly adopted in the Jacobean Court. In 1614–15 the Revels office was still buying ' canvas for the boothes and other necessaries for a play called Bartholmewe Faire ', and the entry seems to suggest ' houses ' of the old type.[2] Possibly Inigo Jones was not sufficiently successful with his Oxford mechanism to inspire confidence. It is not until much later, in Caroline days, that we can clearly discern him beginning to apply to the presentation of Court plays the proscenium arch and the other perfected results of his studies in the mask.[3] There is no obvious trace of the new methods even in his interesting design for the new Cockpit at Court, which may date from about 1632. This shows a building 58 feet square without and octagonal within. Five sides of the octagon are occupied by the auditorium, which contains a pit with balconies above, and apparently a royal box at the back; the other three by a stage 35 feet wide and 16 deep, which stands $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the pit level, and has a 5-foot apron and a semicircular back wall of a 15-foot radius. This does not appear to be adapted either for hangings or for shifting scenes, but is a Palladian façade of two stories in solid architecture adorned with niches and busts and a tablet inscribed ' Prodesse et delectare '. It is pierced below by a large archway and four other doors, and above the archway is a single window.[4]

[1] I. Wake, *Rex Platonicus sive Musae Regnantes* (1607), 46, 79, 112, 134; Nichols, i. 530 (from account, probably by Philip Stringer, in *Harl. MS.* 7044, f. 201). Wake thus describes the hall: ' Partem Aulae superiorem occupavit Scena, cuius Proscenium molliter declive (quod actorum egressui, quasi e monte descendentium, multum attulit dignitatis) in planitiem desinebat. Peripetasmata scenicaque habitacula, machinis ita artificiose ad omnium locorum rerumque varietatem apparata, ut non modo pro singulorum indies spectaculorum, sed etiam pro Scenarum una eademque fabula diversitate subito (ad stuporem omnium) compareret nova totius theatralis fabricae facies.... Media cavea thronus Augustalis cancellis cinctus Principibus erigitur, quem utrinque optimatum stationes communiunt: reliquum inter thronum et theatrum interstitium Heroinarum Gynaeceum est paulo depressius.' In *Annus Recurrens* the scene was a zodiac with a sun moving by artifice, and the play lasted from the Ram to the Fishes. Stringer adds the details about the turning pillars, the false wall, and the participation of Jones.

[2] *Pipe Office, Declared Accounts* (*Revels*), 2805.

[3] Thorndike, 191.

[4] Cf. p. 217.

BOOK II

THE CONTROL OF THE STAGE

Ἀλλὰ μὰ Δί', ἔφη, οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτῳ μέγα φρονῶ. Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ μήν; Ἐπὶ νὴ Δία τοῖς ἄφροσιν. οὗτοι γὰρ τὰ ἐμὰ νευρόσπαστα θεώμενοι τρέφουσί με.—Xenophon, *Symposium*.

VIII

HUMANISM AND PURITANISM

[*Bibliographical Note.*—Most of the material for the present chapter, including extracts from a few pre-Elizabethan writers, is collected in Appendix C; the more official documents in Appendix D are occasionally drawn upon. The Puritan controversy has been studied by C. H. Herford, *A Sketch of the History of the English Drama in its Social Aspects* (1881), and E. N. S. Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage* (1903), from the academic point of view in F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914), and in relation to the theory of dramatic criticism by H. S. Symmes, *Les Débuts de la Critique dramatique en Angleterre jusqu'à la Mort de Shakespeare* (1903), and Renaissance criticism in general by J. E. Spingarn, *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (1899), and G. Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, vol. ii (1902). Useful collections of contemporary treatises are G. Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (1904), and J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (1908).]

The investigations of my opening book have shown clearly enough that in the Tudor, as in the mediaeval, scheme of things there was ample room for the stage and its players. The revelling instinct survived, and the old native love of *mimesis* and *spectacle* had been reinforced by a literary delight in the revival of classical drama and in every form of the give and take of dialogue. Nor was the appreciation of the folk for the ruder forms of sensational and farcical entertainment less keen; and a period of general acceptance of the stage as an element in social life might have been anticipated, in which it stood greatly to gain by the more settled and less migratory habits of the royal household and the possibilities of building up a permanent head-quarters for itself in London which resulted from the change. Unfortunately, however, events moved otherwise. A new factor emerged, which militated against anything like general acceptance; and the period of the greatest literary vitality in the development of the English drama proved to be also a period of embittered conflict with widespread ethical and religious tendencies, which in fact ranged over the whole of social life and was

ultimately destined to shatter, not only the stage, but the Tudor scheme of things itself. In its main outlines the issue was that which had been set ever since the decadent theatre of Greece and Rome came face to face with Semitic asceticism and barbarian indifference. The traditional dislike and contempt of the moralist for the mime had still to find their last expression. But it is a noteworthy aspect of this new revival of the secular struggle, that the attack came less from official churchmanship than from those extreme champions of reformation principles, whose zeal against abuses, and in particular against abuses countenanced by official churchmanship, won them the name of Puritans. The rise of Puritanism was coincident with the beginnings of the agitation against the stage, and the growth of Puritanism in London was the chief feature in a process which stirred the local magistracy, as represented by the Lord Mayor and Corporation of the City, to try its strength, with the stage as a bone of contention, against the central authority of the Privy Council. The controversy is so important a one, from the point of view of the history of the stage and of civilization, that even at the risk of retraversing ground already trod, it is desirable to consider at some length the forces that were at work.[1]

The general relation of Reformation sentiment to the drama is a matter of rather complicated cross-currents. In the first place, there was the humanist rediscovery of the classics, fanning into flame the enthusiasm for Terence which had smouldered throughout the Middle Ages themselves, and making full use in its theory of education of the school-play as a means of inculcating pure Latinity, sound moral precepts, and gentlemanly self-possession in the conduct of affairs. In some at least of its manifestations this tendency is comprehensive enough to include the professional, as well as the academic, player. An example may be found in the treatise *De recta reipublicae administratione* of the German jurist, John Ferrarius. This was written in 1556 and translated into English by William Bavande of the Middle Temple in 1559. It was probably not without its influence upon the line of apologetic adopted by those gentlemen of the Inns of Court to whom the London stage came to look as its warmest supporters. For Ferrarius players are no longer the proscribed folk of the Middle Ages. They have become one of the seven handicrafts of the commonweal; and, provided

[1] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 206.

that care is taken that their performances shall stand with honesty, they have a function, not merely to delight in times of recreation, but also to further morals by ministering ensamples of virtue and goodness to be embraced, and of vice and filthy living to be eschewed. In his short chapter, Ferrarius makes use of two notions, which became commonplaces of Elizabethan dramatic criticism. Both are derived from classical sources. One is Horace's statement in the *De Arte Poetica* of the double object of comedy in the mingling of delight with profit;[1] the other the Plutarchan image of the bee sucking its honey even from noxious herbs, the honey of ethical precept from the herbs of wanton or foolish writings.[2] Even more famous, from its glorification in *Hamlet*, is a third passage which Ferrarius does not cite, and that is the definition of comedy, attributed by the fourth-century grammarian Donatus to Cicero but not discoverable in his extant works, as *imitatio vitae, speculum consuetudinis, imago veritatis*.[3]

There were, however, other humanists who may have shared the abstract ideal of Ferrarius, but who at any rate were sufficiently conscious of the extent to which the popular stage of their own day fell short of that ideal, and were in consequence led to condemn, or perhaps more often to ignore, it. Of such was Ludovicus Vives, who devoted to dramatic poetry a section of his work on the corruption of the arts, in which, while accepting the Horatian account of the end of comedy, he points out that, with the notable exception of the author of *Celestina*, the playwrights, having been driven by the resentment of the great against satire to find their material in love-intrigues and similar themes, had lamentably failed to justify themselves by a proper determination of their plots to the ends of salutary morals. Even for Vives, Plautus and Terence are necessary to education; but he would use his blue pencil, and is by no means so warm a champion of the Latin drama on its ethical side as his older and more famous contemporary Erasmus. In his formal writings on education

[1] Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 343:

> Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
> lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.

Horace's treatise was first translated into English by Thomas Drant in 1567; cf. O. L. Jiriczek, *Der Elisabethanische Horaz* (1911, *Sh.-Jahrbuch*, xlvii. 42).

[2] Plutarch, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debet*, c. xii.

[3] Donatus (ed. Wessner, i. 22), *Excerpta de Comoedia*; cf. *Hamlet*, III. ii. 23, also Gosson's criticism of Lodge's scholarship on this point in App. C, No. xxx.

Erasmus gives Terence the first place amongst Latin writers, adding Plautus with more hesitation and with a stipulation for carefully selected plays. And in a letter written about 1489 to an anonymous friend he tilts with vehemence against the doctrine of certain *homunciones imperituli, imo lividuli*, who maintain that Terence is no fit reading for Christians, and explains to their ignorance that the end of dramatic writing lies precisely in the refutation of vice. Erasmus is closely followed by his English disciple, Sir Thomas Elyot, whose defence of comedies in *The Governour* (1531), as no ' doctrinall of rybaudrie ' but ' a mirrour of man's life, wherin iuell is not taught but discouered ', served as a standard authority to be quoted in support of much later apologetic. Nor is the point of view confined to what may be called the secular wing of humanism. The Terentian school-play is an essential feature in the pedagogy of such convinced reformers as Philip Melanchthon at Wittenberg and John Sturm at Strasburg,[1] and from Sturm the tradition passes direct to one of the most scholarly and by no means one of the least austere of early English Protestants, Roger Ascham. It is to be observed, however, that Ascham's concern for Terence is wholly on the side of letters and Latinity. Both Vives and Erasmus had had their moments of uneasiness as to how far, after all, the ethics of pagan Rome were quite meet to be assimilated by Christian youth. Vives would expurgate both Plautus and Terence, and Erasmus Plautus at least. Ascham, very much impressed with the demoralizing influence of Italian books and Italian manners on English civilization, has no doubt at all that, necessary as both Plautus and Terence are to the schoolmaster, their matter is but ' base stuff ' for the contemplation of the budding divine or civil servant. Views similar to Ascham's had already established themselves amongst both Catholic and Protestant teachers, and the attempt to combine Roman impeccability of phrase with Christian impeccability of theme and incident had produced the remarkable dramatic type known as the ' Christian Terence '.[2] This had had its vernacular, as well as its Latin, developments in many lands. Its acceptability in the eyes of the earlier reformers in England may be illustrated from the chapter *De honestis ludis*, which forms part of the treatise *De regno Christi* written by Martin Bucer as a New Year's gift

[1] W. H. Woodward, *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance*, 218; C. H. Herford, *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*, 101.

[2] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 216.

for Edward VI in 1551.[1] Bucer allows of plays, both for the exercise of youth, and for the honest and not unprofitable delectation of the public. They must be written by learned and pious men, and may be either comedies or tragedies, which deal respectively with mean and exalted actions. For comic themes he instances the dissension between the shepherds of Abraham and Lot, the marriage of Isaac and Rebecca, and Jacob's service amongst the flocks of Laban; and he expounds no less than six moral lessons which the first of these plots may serviceably inculcate. As for tragedy, the histories of patriarchs, kings, prophets, and apostles, from Adam onwards, are full of those περιπέτειαι upon which Aristotle lays such stress. It is from such sources that Christians should draw their poetry, rather than from the impious fables and histories of the Gentiles. And care must be taken to let vice awaken a horror of sin and well-doing a sense of the divine grace; for edification is to be the end of the action, even if, in order to attain it, some sacrifice of literary decorum is necessitated. Bucer holds that plays conceived in this spirit may with advantage be performed by youth in the vernacular, as well as in Greek and Latin; and declares that some have already been written which, although men of secular learning may miss in them the literary graces to be found in the comedies of Aristophanes, Plautus, and Terence and the tragedies of Sophocles, Euripides, and Seneca, are yet to be preferred for their religious character to pieces whose effect upon morality can only be deplorable. It is to be noticed that Bucer proposes to submit all plays before production to the judgement of persons at once expert in the dramatic art and of sound divinity, one of whose functions it shall be to let nothing which is *leve aut histrionicum* be shown. This is interesting not only because it anticipates the actual Tudor experiments in a dramatic censorship, but also because it indicates that the idea of a censorship arose out of ethical, as well as out of merely political, considerations. It is possible that Bucer may have been familiar with the actual working of the system at Geneva, to which further reference will presently be made.

In actual practice the Protestant religious drama, whether it was imitating Latin comedy or advancing on the lines of the popular morality, used the Scriptures with some discrimination. It drew freely upon the historical books and upon the parables. The parable of the prodigal son, in

[1] Extract in App. C, No. v. Symmes, 31, cites Peter Martyr Vermigli as representing the same point of view, but the passage on plays in his *In librum Iudicum Commentarii* (1563), c. 14, reproduced in his *Loci Communes* (1563), Classis ii, c. 12, is not very lucid.

particular, perhaps because it was so obviously cognate to beloved Terentian themes, became the parent of a copious dramatic literature, both in Christian Latin and in all the vernaculars. The central topics, the mysteries of the faith in creation, fall, and incarnation, and the life of Christ himself, were much more charily touched. This may have been due to a reprobation of the methods of the miracle-plays, which is itself traceable to more than one cause. Protestant reverence could hardly fail to reinforce the criticism of the *leve aut histrionicum* in the popular representations, which often made itself heard even amongst orthodox Churchmen. Luther is at one with Ludovicus Vives on the point.[1] And Protestantism had its own particular ground of quarrel with the miracle-plays, in that they were hardly dissociable from the Catholic doctrines of transubstantiation and the like, which their great feast-day of Corpus Christi had been specially invented to glorify. Certainly the decadence of the Corpus Christi play sets in pretty quickly after the middle of the sixteenth century, and in more than one instance the hand of the Protestant reformer is to be traced in the process.[2] It is of the Corpus Christi plays, as well as of the Hock-play at Coventry, that Robert Laneham is thinking when he regrets 'the zeal of certain theyr Preacherz: men very commendabl for their behauiour and learning, & sweet in their sermons, but sumwhat too sour in preaching awey theyr pastime'.[3] An exception to the normal temper of Protestantism in this respect is to be found in that fiery protagonist of the earlier English reformation, John Bale, amongst whose few extant plays are a *Prophetae*, a *John Baptist*, and a *Temptation*, while a list of his various dramatic experiments, which he has himself left upon record, indicates that they included a continuous New Testament cycle from the *Presentation in the Temple* to the *Resurrection*.[4]

It is, of course, in form only and not in spirit that Bale touched the ecclesiastical compilers of the Corpus Christi plays. The author of *Kinge Johan* and the translator of *Pammachius* is the typical English figure of that characteristic sixteenth-century movement whereby the drama, like every other form of literary expression, bound itself for a time to

[1] J. E. Gillet (*M. L. A.* xxxiv. 465), citing e.g. an utterance of 1530, 'Et ego non illibenter viderem gesta Christi in scholis puerorum ludis seu comoediis latine et germanice rite ac pure compositis repraesentari propter rei memoriam et affectum iunioribus augendum'.

[2] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 111.

[3] *Robert Laneham's Letter* (ed. Furnivall), 27.

[4] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 224, 446.

the service of heretical controversy. Both the Christian Terence and the vernacular morality contained elements which could be readily adapted to the purposes of polemic, no less than to those of edification; and Bale appears to have been the principal agent of Cromwell's statecraft in what was probably a deliberate attempt to capture so powerful an engine as the stage in the interests of Protestantism. And it is to be observed that this movement was not confined to those academic branches of the drama in which it may be supposed to have had its origin. For once the theologian and the *histrio* laid aside their ancient antagonism, and not in school and college refectories only, but in every inn-yard and on every village green, the praises of the pure Gospel were sung, and Pope and priests were derided in play, at the bidding of the wily Privy Seal. Of this there is sufficient evidence in the passionate protest of Bale after Cromwell had fallen, and the players' mouths had been shut by the *Act* for the *Advancement of true Religion* in 1543.[1]

None leave ye unvexed and untrobled, no, not so much as the poore minstrels, and players of enterludes, but ye are doing with them. So long as they played lyes, and sange baudy songes, blasphemed God, and corrupted men's consciences, ye never blamed them, but were verye well contented. But sens they persuaded the people to worship theyr Lorde God aryght, accordyng to hys holie lawes and not yours, and to acknoledge Jesus Chryst for their onely redeemer and Saviour without your lowsie legerdemains, ye never were pleased with them.

No doubt many things were changed in English Protestantism after the days of the Marian exile; and a ready explanation of the active Puritan hostility to the stage is afforded by the substitution of a Calvinist for a Lutheran bias in the conduct of the Reformation. But the antithesis must not be pressed too far. Assuredly the returning preachers brought with them a new seriousness in their view of life and a haunting mistrust of the moral evils lurking even in innocent modes of recreation. The 'merry England' of tradition formed no part of their ideal. Moreover, they were less in bondage than their predecessors of Henry's reign to the prestige of secular learning, and less likely to be impressed, therefore, by the

[1] *Mediæval Stage*, ii. 222. The passage quoted is from the *Epistel Exhortatorye of an Inglyshe Christian* (1544), written under the pseudonym of Henry Stalbridge. Foxe, *Book of Martyrs*, vi. 57, says of Bishop Gardiner, 'He thwarteth and wrangleth much against players, printers, preachers. And no marvel why: for he seeth these three things to be set up of God, as a triple bulwark against the triple crown of the Pope to bring him down: as, God be praised, they have done meetly well already.'

literary and educational significance of the drama. But so far as the popular stage is concerned, there is no reason to suppose that they would have failed to see eye to eye with John Bale himself, for it is pretty clear from the passage quoted above that Bale's tolerance of the interlude-players was entirely conditioned by the polemical use he had been enabled to make of them, and that, apart from what he chose to regard as their conversion, they would have had short shrift at his hands. Now by the time of the Puritans this break in the normal relations of the stage to the pulpit had come to an end. The drama of Protestant controversy survived its original manipulator, Cromwell. It flourished greatly under Edward VI. It won the imitation of the Catholics under Mary. And when Elizabeth came, its exponents made haste to re-enter a field which was probably by now capable of yielding profit in a worldly as well as a spiritual sense. It is clear that at the beginning of the reign Elizabeth and her ministers deliberately continued Cromwell's policy of encouraging stage-polemic. During the Christmas of 1558 the court and the streets were full of masks, in which cardinals, bishops, and abbots were held up to derision as crows, asses, and wolves.[1] During the debates on the Act of Uniformity in the following spring, Abbot Feckenham protested against the way in which ' by the onely preachers and scaffold players of this newe religion, all thinges are turned up-side downe '.[2] Almost simultaneously the dispatches of Venetian agents mention the prevalence of anti-Catholic plays in hostels and taverns, and dwell particularly upon one performance in which Philip and Mary and Cardinal Pole were represented in exposition of their religious views.[3] The inwardness of the movement is made clear by a letter of the Duke of Feria to Philip himself, in which he reports Elizabeth's diplomatic repudiation of the insolent pieces, and adds that he knew for a fact

[1] Cf. ch. v.

[2] Strype, *Annals*, I. ii. 436, ' Sithence the comynge and reigne of our most soveraigne and dear lady quene Elizabeth, by the onely preachers and scaffold players of this newe religion, all thinges are turned up-side downe, and notwithstandinge the quenes majesties proclamations most godly made to the contrarye, and her vertuous example of lyvinge, sufficyent to move the hearts of all obedyent subjects to the due service and honour of God.' If a proclamation as to plays is meant, it must be the earlier one of 8 April 1559, as the speech was probably delivered in the debate on the second reading of the Act of Uniformity on 26 April. Strype, I. i. 109, points out that it is definitely assigned by *Cotton MS. Vesp.* D 18, to Feckenham, and that Burnet's ascription to Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York, which has been followed by Collier, i. 168, and others, rests on a mistaken note by a later hand on a copy in a *O. C. C. C. Synodalia MS.*

[3] *V. P.* vii. 65, 71, 80.

that the arguments were given to the players by none other than Sir William Cecil.[1] The Elizabethan methods of government were tortuous, and it is a little difficult to say how long the licence of the stage to deal with matters of religion lasted. Ostensibly the proclamation of 16 May 1559, presumably issued in deference to De Feria's complaints, brought it to a very definite stop. But it was one thing to issue a proclamation and another to see that it was enforced; and as late as the June of 1562 we find De Feria's successor, the Bishop of Aquila, still protesting against Elizabeth's failure to carry out her perpetual promises, by suppressing the books, farces, and songs which were written in dishonour of his royal master.[2] The burden of these, however, may have been political rather than strictly religious. Certainly, when Elizabeth considered that she had 'settled' the affairs of the Church, it in no way remained part of her intention that they should continue to be matter for public debate. Nor is it likely that the extreme vulgarities of Protestant controversy were altogether to her private taste. Already during the Christmas of 1559 a play at court had been broken off for some unknown offence, and when some Cambridge students pursued the queen to Hinchinbrook in the autumn of 1564 with a scandalous dramatic parody of Catholic ritual, the royal displeasure was unmistakable.[3] Meanwhile the pulpit attacks upon the 'fleshly and filthy' sayings and doings of players begin with Bishop Alley's St. Paul's sermon delivered in 1561, and it is natural to suppose that the temporary alliance between Church and Stage was already dissolved and the normal hostility restored, before Bishop Grindal came to pen his vehement outburst to Cecil on 23 February 1564 in favour of the permanent inhibition of the '*histriones*, common playours', that 'idle sorte off people, which have ben infamouse in all goode common weales'. The theory that the first controversial phase of the

[1] *Sp. P.* i. 62 (29 April 1559), 'She was very emphatic in saying that she wished to punish severely certain persons who had represented some comedies in which your Majesty was taken off. I passed it by, and said that these were matter of less importance than the others, although both in jest and earnest more respect ought to be paid to so great a prince as your Majesty, and I knew that a member of her Council had given the arguments to construct these comedies, which is true, for Cecil gave them, as indeed she partly admitted to me.'

[2] *Sp. P.* i. 247. England and Protestantism got as good as they gave. Bohun, 99, records how, about 1560–2, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton was made the butt of French court jesters and comedians. Mary of Scotland was hardly persuaded, in 1565, to punish some Catholics who had made a play against the ministers, with a mock baptism of a cat in it (Randolph to Cecil, in Wright, *Eliz.* i. 190).

[3] Cf. ch. v.

Elizabethan popular drama was but of short duration need not be regarded as invalidated by the fact that plays of distinctly Protestant type continued to be published until at least the third decade of the reign. There is no very obvious proof that these plays were performed at all, and certainly none that they belonged to the popular rather than the academic stage. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that the dates of composition fell anywhere near the dates of publication, and in some cases such evidence as is available points to a period very shortly after Elizabeth's accession. Several Protestant plays of Edwardian or earlier origin were apparently revived by publishers at about the same time.[1] In some of these the closing prayers have been altered so as to apply to Elizabeth, and a similar revision has taken place in the text, extant only in manuscript, of Bale's *Kinge Johan*. This seems to be evidence, perhaps more certainly as regards the manuscript than as regards the prints, of actual performance during the new reign.

If, then, what might have been the natural attitude of the earlier English Protestantism to the popular stage was deflected by something of an accident, it is also not quite true to suppose that Calvinism was always and everywhere uncompromisingly opposed to the drama in its more respectable forms. Calvin himself was not unaffected by humanist influences, and more than one of his near associates, notably Theodore Beza, his successor at Geneva, are to be reckoned amongst academic playwrights. The annals of stage-history at Geneva throw a valuable light upon the order of ideas from which the Puritans started. During the later Middle Ages the city had taken its full delight in *spectacula* of many kinds. The abuses connected with these had formed the subject of constant ecclesiastical prohibitions, the tradition of which had only been continued by the reformers.[2] Calvin's principal forerunner, William Farel, had published *theses* at Bâle in 1524, in which he laid down abstinence from disguisings as a counsel of perfection.[3] But he did not succeed

[1] Cf. ch. xxii.

[2] Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 207 (*Annales Calviniani*), gives prohibitions made under Farel's influence in 1537; for earlier records, cf. E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, iii. 579; H. D. Foster, *Geneva before Calvin* in *American Hist. Review*, viii. 231.

[3] A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, i. 195, 'Christianum alienum oportet a bachanalibus quae gentium more celebrantur, et ab hypocrisi Iudaica in ieiuniis et aliis quae non directore spiritu fiunt: ac cavere oportet a simulachris quam maxime.' Possibly, however, 'simulachra' means 'images' rather than 'disguisings'.

in making his principles wholly operative at Geneva, and even when, after an abortive attempt in 1537, the so-called 'theocracy' was finally established by Calvin's constitutions of 1541, there was no absolute condemnation, except for the clergy, of plays.[1] Dances were prohibited and such heathen ceremonies as the *Roi-boit* at Twelfth Night and the *Mardi-gras*[2]; but it seems to have been thought sufficient to leave plays under the close inspection and control of the body of ministers, whose functions included the maintenance of Church discipline with the aid of a consistory of elders, and the advising of the secular town council on all matters appertaining to faith and morals. It was not long, however, before more radical views began to commend themselves to a certain section of the ministers, and the question came to a serious issue in some stormy episodes of the year 1546. On 2 May, being Quasimodo Sunday, the council had permitted the performance of a morality by one Roux Monet and others. They had before them a certificate from the ministers that it was of an edifying character, although some grumbling persons declared that its object was to ridicule and satirize the tradesmen.[3] About a month later, two fresh applications came before them. One was apparently from a troupe of travelling players and acrobats, and this was summarily refused as likely to cause scandal.[4] The other was more plausible. Some local *joueurs des ystoires* desired to represent for the edification of the people a dramatization of *The Acts of the Apostles*. The council ordered the book of the piece to be submitted

[1] Calvin, *Opera*, x[a]. 5, 16.

[2] The proceedings against Mme Françoise Perrin for allowing a dance in her house are described in A. Roget, *Hist. du Peuple de Genève*, ii. 225. In 1550 the council resolved (Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 460), 'Item des ordonnances des dances qu'elles ne soyent point admoindries mais que l'on ne soufre pas cela. Surquoy est arreste que soyent faictes cries a voix de trompe que nulz naye a danser ny chanter chansons deshonnestes ny dancer en façon que soit: sur poienne de estre mis troys iours en prison en pain et eaue et de soixante sols pour une chescune foy la moytie applique a l'hospital et laultre moytie a la court'. In 1557 (*Opera*, xxi. 662) persons were brought before the consistory on an accusation of 'insolences faictes a un royaulme'. They had a cake, and in one girl's slice 'y mirent ung grain de genievre et pour ce lappellerent Royne et crierent a aulte voix la Royne boit'.

[3] Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 379; cf. Roget, ii. 235.

[4] Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 382; cf. Roget, ii. 238, 'Aulcungs joueurs des antiques et puissance de Hercules ont prié que plaise a MM. de les laisser jouer de bonne grâce la bataille des Mores et puissance de Harodes et aultres antiques héros. Arresté pour obvier scandalle que ne doibgent point jouer, mes que demain se doibgent retirer.' Cf. the notices of the Hercules performances at Paris in 1572 and at Utrecht in 1586 (ch. xiii, s.v. Leicester's), and p. 152, n. 1, for an early Italian parallel.

to Calvin, and agreed that it might be performed, should his report be favourable. Calvin and the other ministers did not much like the proposal, more particularly as the players declined to give alms to the poor out of the profits of the enterprise. It so happened, however, that one of the ministers, Abel Poupin, was himself the author of the play, and partly because of this, and partly because he was not sure that an attempt to prevent the performance would be successful, Calvin seems to have persuaded his colleagues to offer no objection. The formal sanction of the council was therefore given, and Abel Poupin was ordered to make himself responsible for the conduct of the play. Reading between the lines, we may perhaps discern some resentment amongst the ministers, not only at the performance itself, which they considered a waste of money that might have gone in charity, but also at the domineering attitude adopted by Calvin and Poupin. Even while the matter was still under discussion, one of them, Philibert de Beauxlieux, was haled before the consistory for saying that Calvin was taking the part of the Pope and Poupin that of the cardinal. And when the decision was arrived at there was an outbreak. A preacher of fiery temper, Michel Cop, got into the pulpit and denounced the play, accusing the women performers of a shameless desire to display themselves in public and thereby ensnare the eyes of men. For this he was summoned before the council; but Calvin took his part, and although they had differed as to the toleration of the play, claimed that Cop had only exercised the preacher's proper liberty in saying freely what he thought on a question of morals.[1] The documents concerning this incident include, in addition to numerous entries in official registers, two private letters from Calvin to Farel,[2] in which he describes what had taken place, and makes it clear that his own willingness to allow the play arose from motives of expediency and from a feeling that there were limits to the pressure which could be put upon the public to abstain from

[1] Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 381–4; cf. Roget, ii. 236; Doumergue, iii. 579; W. Walker, *John Calvin*, 298.

[2] Calvin, *Ep.* 800 (*Opera*, xii. 347), '. . . Nihil hic habemus novi, nisi quod secunda comedia iam cuditur. Cuius actionem testati sumus nobis minime probari. Pugnare tamen ad extremum noluimus, quia periculum erat ne elevaremus nostram autoritatem, si pertinaciter repugnando tandem vinceremur. Video non posse negari omnia oblectamenta. Itaque mihi satis est si hoc, quod non est adeo vitiosum, indulgeri sibi intelligant, sed nobis invitis . . .' This was on 3 June. *Ep.* 807 (*Opera*, xii. 355), of 4 July, describes the dissensions amongst the ministers, and adds, 'Auditis fratribus, respondi multas ob causas nobis non videri expedire ut agerentur, et simul causas exposui; nos tamen nolle contendere, si senatus contenderet . . . nunc ludi aguntur'.

recreation. In reply the aged reformer anticipated the probable future destiny of the frequenters of plays in terms which recall the worst ferocities of Tertullian on this subject.[1] Something more may be gathered as to Calvin's personal attitude towards plays from a sermon preached in 1556, in which he expounds the prohibition of the change of sex-costume in *Deuteronomy* xxii. 5 as an absolute one, and as applying particularly to the wearing of men's dresses by women and of women's dresses by men in masks and mummeries.[2] This is an exegesis which counted for a good deal in the Puritan criticism of a stage in which boys habitually took the female parts.

Abel Poupin's much-discussed *Acts of the Apostles* was duly given, and the council ordered themselves *loges* at the public expense to see the show, and decreed a four days' suspension of arrest for debt in honour of the occasion. Shortly afterwards the ministers approached the council as a body in order to urge that the money devoted to plays might be better bestowed on the poor, and it was thereupon resolved that no more *ystoyres* should be given '*jusque lon voye le temps plus propre*'.[3] This determination must, I think, have been motived by some temporary conditions of special economic distress, for it was far from being the end of plays in Geneva. In the following year, 1547, Richard Chaultemps and his wife and children were refused permission for a *jeu de passe-temps*, which was thought contrary to Christianity, and were given a *teston* to go on their way. On the other hand, the council attended officially in the same year at a performance of a Latin dialogue '*du livre de Joseph*' by the scholars of the college. In 1548 a wandering *tragechieur*

[1] Calvin, *Ep.* 802 (*Opera*, xii. 351) 'Farellus Calvino . . . Isti qui tam delectantur ludis, utinam non serio dolore torqueantur. Timendum est, ne qui alienis personis oblectantur quum propriam in Christo debeant sustinere in omni genere officiorum, ne ferre cogantur non personatos, qui fingunt nocere, sed qui nimis vere afflictent et angant. Sed quis tandem perfectam . . . habebit plebem? Utinam in malis personati tandem essent, nec aliquid ipsi facerent, tantum aliorum peccata repraesentarent . . . omnes ea vitarent, in bonis veri essent actores, imo factores . . . 16 Iunii, 1546.'

[2] Calvin, *Sermo*, cxxvi (*Opera*, xxviii. 18), 'Ainsi donc ce n'est point sans cause que ceste loy a esté mise; et ceux qui prennent plaisir à se desguiser, despittent Dieu: comme en ces masques, et en ces momons, quand les femmes s'accoustrent en hommes, et les hommes en femmes, ainsi qu'on en fait: et qu'adviendra-t-il? Encores qu'il n'y eust point nulle mauvaise queue, la chose en soy est desplaisante à Dieu: nous oyons ce qui en est ici prononcé: *Quiconques le fait, est en abomination.*' Other sermons, e.g. *Sermo* lvii, condemn dances and *jeux* generally, without any special stress on plays; cf. P. Lobstein, *Die Ethik Calvins*, 113.

[3] Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 385.

was allowed to perform on condition of avoiding any '*chose contre Dieu*'. In 1549 the scholars played a comedy of Terence in a meadow, and received a gift of two crowns for a banquet. In 1551 the council forbade the recitation of a *ballade* by Abel Poupin at a banquet, but sanctioned a '*petite farce de joyeuseté*' for recreation's sake. In 1558 the seigneurs of Berne paid a visit to Geneva and one Maître Enoch proposed a play on a subject taken from the Berne *armoiries* of Jupiter and Europa, and another on the execution of five Berne scholars at Lyons. This application was referred to Calvin for a report. In 1560 the reprinting of Beza's tragedy of *Abraham's Sacrifice* was approved by the consistory. In 1561 Conrad Badius's comedy of *Le Pape Malade* was performed in the college hall and afterwards printed, and permission was also given for a comedy by Jerome Wyart, '*si M. Calvin est de cet avis*'. An interval of some years without plays followed, until in 1568 the series was resumed with Jacques Bienvenu's comedy of *Le Monde Malade et Mal Pansé*.[1] It is hardly necessary to carry the record further, since the proof is sufficient that, whatever the private opinions of some of the ministers may have been, the actual working of the theocracy was not inconsistent with the production, under a careful censorship, of academic or bourgeois plays, or even, although more rarely, of entertainments of the type afforded by a professional *tragechieur*. It was not until 1572 that the Synod of Nîmes passed a constitution for the whole of the French reformed churches, by which all plays, other than those of a strictly educational character, were forbidden.[2]

It must be doubtful whether even this decree would have fully met the views of Michel Cop and his supporters. At any rate, it is possible to trace the growth of a sentiment amongst English theologians of the Calvinistic persuasion,

[1] Calvin, *Opera*, xxi. 406, 450, 684, 734; Roget, ii. 238, 243; iii. 139; vi. 192; Doumergue, iii. 579, sqq.

[2] *Discipline des Églises Réformées*, ch. xiv, art. 28 (*Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. du Protestantisme*, xxxv. 211), 'Il ne sera aussi permis aux fidèles d'assister aux comédies, tragédies, farces, moralités et autres jeux, joués en public ou en particulier, vu que de tout temps cela a été défendu entre chrétiens, comme apportant corruption de bonnes mœurs, mais surtout quand l'Écriture sainte est profanée; néanmoins, quand, dans un collège, il sera trouvé utile à la jeunesse de représenter quelque histoire, on la pourra tolérer pourvu qu'elle ne soit comprise en l'Écriture sainte, qui n'est pas donnée pour être jouée, mais purement prêchée, et aussi que cela se fasse rarement et par l'avis du Colloque qui en verra la composition.' The original decree of the Synod of Poitiers in 1560, to which this was an addition, only laid down that 'les momeries et batelleries ne seront point souffertes, ni faire le Roi boit, ni le Mardi gras'.

which was not prepared to exclude the academic play from the general condemnation of things theatrical. Naturally this tendency shows itself mainly at the Universities, where tragedies and comedies, both in Latin and in English, continued to be part of the ordinary exercise of youth, especially when Christmas was kept or entertainment had to be found for a royal visit, and where men of high ecclesiastical standing, such as James Calfhill, Penitentiary of St. Paul's and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, did not disdain to furnish dramas for the use of their scholars.[1] So far as Cambridge is concerned, we find Vice-Chancellor Beaumont reporting to Archbishop Parker in 1565 that 'two or three in Trinity College think it very unseeming that Christians should play or be present at any profane comedies or tragedies'.[2] We find Sir John Harington, who was an undergraduate from 1576 to 1578, noting his recollection about 1597 that 'in Cambridge, howsoever the presyser sort have banisht them, the wyser sort did, and still doe mayntayn them'. And we find John Smith of Christ's haled before the University for an unguarded attack upon the less strict practice of his fellows in a Lenten sermon of 1586.[3] It was at Oxford, however, that the divergence of opinion became most articulate. The protagonist was John Rainolds, afterwards President of Corpus Christi College, and a man of great influence in the Puritan party, whom he represented at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604. Rainolds first touched the question, to which his attention was probably called by the dispute then raging in London, with a passing allusion to the '*pestes scenicorum, theatralia spectacula*' as one of the great interruptions to Oxford studies, in his preface to some disputations published in 1581. There is no reason to suppose that he voiced the general view of the University, and in particular of those of its members who were still under the influence of the humanist spirit. Probably these were better represented by the commentaries on the *Ethics* and *Politics* of Aristotle published by John Case, Fellow of St. John's College, in his *Speculum moralium quaestionum* (1585) and *Sphaera civitatis* (1588). Case commends plays, provided that they are an expression of *comitas*, the Aristotelian εὐτραπελία, and not of its excess *scurrilitas*. They are sanctioned by the use of

[1] Cf. ch. xxiii, s.v. Calfhill, for Walter Haddon's somewhat slighting reference to his *theatri celebritas*.

[2] *Parker Correspondence* (Parker Soc.), 226.

[3] Strype, *Annals* (1824), III. i. 496. Smith had said, 'Si illud verum sit quod auditione accepi, istius modi certe ludos diris devoveo et actores et spectatores'.

antiquity, and they give a lively picture of antiquity itself. They teach experience of things and of the human heart, and afford training—it is the *scenae trigemina corona*—in the management of the voice, the features, the gestures. All this is, of course, in the traditional humanist vein. Some of the current criticisms of the drama are quoted, only to be refuted. It is not necessarily *indecorum* for a man to wear the dress of a harlot on the stage, if his object is to expose the vices of harlotry, '*non est enim monstrum vestes sed mores meretricis induere*'. It is true that the Fathers condemned plays, but they had in mind the abuses of plays and in particular the devotion of plays to the service of idols. It is ridiculous to hold that the dignity of kingship is offended if it is impersonated by an actor. The offence is no more than when the outlines of a king are represented in a picture. No doubt Case has the academic drama almost wholly in his mind, and would have been inclined to dismiss the professional stage contemptuously enough as *scurrilitas*.[1] He is certainly careful to make it clear that the plays of which he approves are not '*inanes et histrionicae fabulae, Veneris illecebrae*', but witty comedies and magnificent tragedies '*in quibus expressa imago vitae morumque cernitur*'. He did not convince John Rainolds; it is just possible that the ninepin arguments, which in true scholastic fashion he set up and knocked down again, were hardly to be accepted as an adequate statement of the Puritan position. Rainolds evidently acquired a reputation in the University for 'preciseness' as regards the drama; and the time came when the academic playwrights thought it well to challenge him in public. Their champion was Dr. William Gager of Christ Church, two of whose plays, *Ulysses Redux* and *Rivales*, were down for performance by the Christ Church students during the Christmas of 1591–2. Rainolds was invited by one Thomas Thornton to see the *Ulysses Redux*. He refused and being pressed gave his reasons. It was not therefore unnatural that when Gager appended to the *Hippolytus*, which was also given, a new apologetical epilogue in which arguments against the stage, very similar to those of Rainolds, were put into the mouth of one Momus, our theologian should infer that by Momus none other was intended than himself. He must have cried '*Touché*', and thereby gave Gager an opportunity of sending him a printed

[1] I am not writing the history of the Oxford stage, but it is pertinent to note that a statute of 1584, just as Case was writing, had excluded common stage-plays from the University, both on grounds of health and economy, and that 'the younger sort . . . may not be spectatours of so many lewde and evill sports as in them are practised' (Boas, 225).

copy of *Ulysses*, with an enlarged epilogue and a repudiation of any personal intention in the character of Momus. This led to a letter from Rainolds, in which he set out his views upon the stage at great length and with considerable learning, to a reply from Gager, who was or professed to be stung by some of the reflections cast by Rainolds upon the Christ Church men, and to a rejoinder from Rainolds, in which he reiterated his original arguments with even greater elaboration. His main contentions were four in number. Firstly, he laid stress upon the *infamia* with which the Roman praetors had 'noted' *histriones*, and refused to accept Gager's pleas that this only applied to those who played for gain, or that gentlemen who only appeared upon the stage rarely and at long intervals could not properly be called *histriones* at all. Secondly, he adopted Calvin's interpretation of the Deuteronomic prohibition of the change of sex-costume as an absolute one, belonging to the moral and not merely the ceremonial law. Gager had taken the view, which later on had the support of the learned Selden, and which to a folklorist hardly needs demonstration, that what Moses had in mind was a change of costume forming part of an idolatrous ritual; and had also committed himself to the weaker argument that a man might justifiably, as Achilles did, put on a woman's clothing to save his life. The latter Rainolds denied, and pointed out that, even if it held good, it would hardly cover a change designed for a purely histrionic purpose. His third argument was based on the moral deterioration entailed by counterfeiting wanton behaviour in a play; and his fourth on the waste both of time and money involved. He does not wish to be thought an enemy either of poetry or of reasonable recreation, but he expresses a doubt whether some hours were not spent over Gager's plays that ought to have been spent at sermons. The theory of humanistic educators that acting teaches lads self-confidence he is not prepared to admit as a sufficient justification of their practice. The debate is, of course, a good deal complicated by topics of mere erudition and by disputes as to whether Momus was really meant as a caricature of Rainolds, or as to whether Rainolds's abstract argument about *infamia* bore the concrete implication that such honest youths as the Christ Church students or so well-voiced a musician as the Master of the Choristers, who had played with them, were in fact *infames*, or as to the extent of approval implied by the presence of University dignitaries and of the queen herself at performances of Gager's pieces. Anyway, said Rainolds, the queen's laws set down players as vagabonds. Given their common pre-

mises, it must be acknowledged that both in learning and in logic the Puritan had the advantage over his opponent, although common sense was on the side of the latter, and it is with some scepticism that one reads the statement of the printer who gave Rainolds's share of the controversy to the world in 1599, that ultimately Gager 'let goe his hold, and in a Christian modestie and humilitie yeelded to the truth, and quite altered his iudgement'. My own conviction is that Gager would have subscribed to anything, in order to have done with receiving argumentative letters from Rainolds. But when Rainolds had disposed of Gager, he had to meet a fresh adversary in Alberico Gentili, an Italian who held the professorship of civil law at Oxford and had committed himself to a different view as to the force of the praetorian *infamia*. Between these two pundits the discussion continued for some time without contributing much to the elucidation of the main issue. Rainolds's book, the first line of the title of which was *Th' overthrow of Stage-Playes*, furnished many weapons later on for the armoury of Prynne, and material for ridicule in the play of *Fucus, sive Histriomastix*, produced at Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1623.

The problem with which, long before the University disputants handled the matter at all, the London Puritans had to deal, was not one of nice differentiation between the position of the amateur and that of the professional player. Their concern with the academic drama was comparatively small; some at least of them were prepared to subscribe to all the allowances for it that were made by the Synod of Nîmes.[1] What they were face to face with was the rapid growth in London of professional playing as a recognized occupation, using an increasing number of playing-places, almost entirely free from control on its ethical side, and tending more and more to become a permanent element in the life of the community. And the attitude of condemnation which they adopted was in the main one in which Lutheran, Calvinist, and humanist, Case and Gager no less than Rainolds, would in theory at least have concurred. The writings against the stage, especially those of the critical period from 1576 to 1583, are of a very heterogeneous character. The most important are, on the one hand, long passages in two treatises by ministers devoted to the flagellation of social evils generally, the *Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine Playes, or Enterludes* (1577) of John Northbrooke, and the *Anatomie of Abuses* (1583) of Phillip Stubbes; and on the other, three special pamphlets

[1] Northbrooke, 103. Stubbes took the same line in the *Preface* to his first edition, but afterwards cancelled the passage.

by sometime playwrights who had embraced conversion, and had the advantage of speaking from inner knowledge of the profession they were attacking. Of these two, *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579) and *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* (1582) were by Stephen Gosson, who became the vicar of St. Botolph's in the City, and the third was by Anthony Munday, who, as Gosson put it, returned to his own vomit again, and resumed play-writing. Munday's contribution was the *Third Blast* of a composite publication issued under the title of *A Second and Third Blast of Retrait from Plaies and Theaters* (1580). The *Second Blast* was a translation of the chapter against *spectacula* from Salvian's fifth-century *De Gubernatione Dei*.[1] These five books form the main indictment of the stage, as it developed itself at Puritan hands or under Puritan influences. In addition there were many minor onslaughts, in sermons by Thomas White (1577), John Stockwood (1578), and others at the famous City pulpit of Paul's Cross, in works of devotional theology, such as Gervase Babington's *Exposition of the Commandements* (1583), and in many examples of the miscellaneous literature that stood for modern journalism. The arguments used in support of the attack are naturally various. Some of them coincide with those used later by Rainolds at Oxford. Calvin's objection, based on Deuteronomy, to the wearing of women's clothes by boys makes its appearance.[2] The condemnations of *histriones* by the Fathers and by the austerer pagans are applied without discrimination to their Elizabethan successors, and there is a deliberate attempt to brand these alike with the Roman note of *infamia* and with the more recent stigma of vagabondage. The historical disquisitions lay much stress on the origin of pagan plays in idolatry. Gosson, who in his second book affects a methodical treatment of the subject, and draws upon his recollection of Aristotle for analysis of the efficient, material, formal, final causes and effects of plays, justifies himself from Tertullian in finding the efficient cause of plays in none other than the incarnate Devil.[3] He also derives from Aristotle, although he knew less of Aristotle than did John Case, a theory that acting, being essentially the simulation of what is not, is by its very nature 'with in the compasse of a lye, which by Aristotles judgment is naught of it selfe and to be fledde'.[4] A similar doctrine is readily applied to the imaginations of poets which give actors their opportunity.[5] As Touchstone puts it, poetry is not 'honest in deed and word' nor 'a true thing', for 'the truest poetry is the most feigning'.[6]

[1] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, i. 18.
[2] Gosson, *P. C.* 195. [3] Gosson, *P. C.* 169. [4] Gosson, *P. C.* 197.
[5] Gosson, *P. C.* 188 Munday, 145. [6] *A. Y. L.* III. iii. 17.

Whatever weight such abstract reasonings may have carried, they were after all but the fringes and trimmings of the controversy. The main burden of the complaints raised by the Puritans rested neither on theology nor on history, but on the character of the London plays as they knew them, and on the actual conditions under which representations were given. In a stage from which Protestant polemic was now banned, they found nothing but *scurrilitas*. They resented the impurity of speech and gesture. They resented the scoffs at virtue and religion, especially when these were interlaced with themes taken, as dramatic themes were still often taken, from the Scriptures.[1] And their disapproval was hardly less when the plays were wholly secular, for in tragedies they could discern nothing but examples to honest citizens of murders, treacheries, and rebellions, and in comedies nothing but demoralizing pictures of intrigues and wantonness. Plays, they declared, are the snares of the devil set to catch souls. By plays the imagination of youth is corrupted, and matronly chastity first turned to thoughts of sin. With their ready touch upon vituperative rhetoric, they found for the theatre a string of nicknames of which Gosson's 'the school of abuse' was the model, and 'the school of bawdery', 'the nest of the devil', 'the consultorie of Satan', may serve as further samples. And what the plays began, they held that the surroundings of the playhouses were only too well adapted to finish. In them was focused all the sin of the city. Here men came, not merely to waste their time and their money, but to meet wantons, and to whisper dishonourable proposals in the ears of any respectable women with whom they found themselves in company. The constant presence of harlots amongst the audience, the dallying with them in the front of the galleries, the manning of them home afterwards, even if the buildings adjacent to the stage did not themselves afford a convenient shelter for ill-doing, are dwelt upon with a vigour of description which perhaps testifies to the horror wherewith this connexion of the stage with sexual immorality had affected the Puritan mind.[2]

Above all, there was Sabbatarianism to be taken into account. During the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign, Sunday was the usual day for plays. The trumpets blew for the performances just as the bells were tolling for afternoon prayer; and writer after writer bears testimony to the fact that too often the yards and galleries were filled with an appreciative crowd, while the preacher's sermon was unfre-

[1] Northbrooke, 92; Munday, 144; Stubbes, 140.
[2] Gosson, *S. A.* 35; *P. C.* 215; Munday, 139.

quented.[1] Thus a touch of professional *amour propre* gave its sting to the conflict, and there is no one point that is more insisted upon in sermon after sermon and pamphlet after pamphlet than the desecration of the Lord's Day which the attendance at theatres directly entailed. The preachers did not disdain an appeal to popular superstitions which they probably themselves shared, and the visitations of plague from which Elizabethan London regularly suffered,[2] no less than such events as earthquakes[3] or the fall of ruinous buildings,[4] were interpreted as tokens of divine wrath at the wickedness of plays and in particular at the breach of the Fourth Commandment. A curious legend was whispered abroad in various forms, to the effect that the devil himself had been known on occasion to take an unrehearsed part in this or that godless piece.[5]

The playwright, no less than the theologian, has a ready pen, and the Puritan attacks naturally provoked a counter-literature of apology. This first took shape in critical prefaces attached to such contemporary plays, mainly of literary rather than stage origin, as reached the honours of print.[6] Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse*, a treacherous performance from the point of view of his former colleagues, called for a more elaborate reply. More than one pamphlet was written, of which the *Honest Excuses* (*c.* 1579) of Thomas Lodge has alone come down to us. The serious argument of this, as well as of the prefaces which preceded it, continues the main humanist tradition. Against the denunciations of the Fathers and of certain pagan moralists, the apologists set the antiquity of plays and the honour in which after all they were held in the palmy days of Greece and Rome. The examples of violence and wantonness in tragedy and comedy they justify by the moral end of drama. Decorum—the literary sense of

[1] Northbrooke, 92; Stockwood, 23; Munday, 128; Field, *Epistle*.

[2] White, 46; Gosson, *P. C.* 215.

[3] Stubbes, 180, speaks of serious accidents at theatres due to panic at an earthquake, which must be that of 6 April 1580; but the account published at the time (cf. App. C, No. xxv) makes no reference to theatres, although it does, oddly enough, record that the only deaths were those of two children who were listening to a sermon in Christ Church, Newgate.

[4] The fall of the Paris Garden bear-baiting house on 13 January 1583 led John Field, in his *A Godly Exhortation* (1583) on that event, which is closely related to the anti-stage literature, to anticipate a similar fate for the theatres. The Puritans should have taken to heart the wise comment of Sir Thomas More on a similar occasion (cf. ch. xvi, s.v. Hope).

[5] Cf. ch. xxiii, s.v. Marlowe, *Dr. Faustus*.

[6] Cf. App. C, Nos. iv, ix, x, xiv, xix. Something might be added from the prefaces of the Senecan translators (cf. ch. xxiii).

what is psychologically appropriate to a given character—requires that, as George Whetstone puts it, 'grave old men should instruct, yonge men should show the imperfections of youth, strumpets should be lascivious, boyes unhappy, and clownes should be disorderly'. But whether the action be merry or mournful, grave or lascivious, the ultimate object is edification, even as the bee sucks honey from flowers and weeds alike. 'By the rewarde of the good, the good are encowraged in well doinge; and with the scowrge of the lewde, the lewde are feared from evil attempts.' Comedy, no doubt, aims at delight, but it is a delight which, on the Horatian principle, is mingled with the useful. This appears to have been the especial theme of the *Play of Plays and Pastimes*, in which the actors essayed their own defence on the boards of the Theatre. Unfortunately this piece is only known by Gosson's unfriendly account of its plot in *Playes Confuted*.[1] It was in the form of an allegorical morality, in which was shown the dependence of Life on Delight and Recreation as a protection from Glut and Tediousness, and how Zeal, in order to govern Life aright, must be reduced to Moderate Zeal and work hand in hand with Delight, using comedies for which it is prescribed 'that the matter be purged, deformities blazed, sinne rebuked, honest mirth intermingled, and fitte time for the hearing of the same appointed'. It is the note of humanism, again, which is prominent in the group of critical writings of which the first and most important is Sir Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poetry* (*c.* 1583). It is reasonable to suppose that this treatise had its origin in the train of ideas awakened by the Puritan outcries. Gosson had dedicated *The Schoole of Abuse* to Sidney, and as Gabriel Harvey told Spenser, was 'for hys labor scorned; if at leaste it be in the goodnesse of that nature to scorne'. Certainly the *Defence* can hardly be regarded as a direct contribution to the controversy. Sidney was not particularly concerned to uphold the contemporary stage, and occupied himself rather with answering a general attack upon poetry contained in *The Schoole of Abuse*, which had been merely incidental to Gosson's principal argument. But in the course of his discussion he comes to examine tragedy and comedy as branches of imaginative literature, and the definitions which he frames are conceived once more in the full spirit of humanism. He speaks of 'high and excellent tragedy, that openeth the greatest wounds, and showeth forth the ulcers that are covered with tissue; that maketh kings fear to be tyrants and tyrants manifest their tyrannical humors; that with stirring the

[1] Gosson, *P. C.* 201.

effects of admiration and commiseration teacheth the uncertainty of this world, and upon how weak foundations gilden roofs are builded'. So, too, the work of the comic poet is 'an imitation of the common errors of our life which he representeth in the most ridiculous and scornful sort that may be, so as it is impossible that any beholder can be content to be such a one'. The *Defence* was not published until 1595, but it must have been well known in private before that, since, itself founded on such Italian writers as Scaliger, Minturno, and Castelvetro, it in turn furnished inspiration for William Webbe's *Discourse of English Poesie* (1586), Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* (1589), and Sir John Harington's *Apologie of Poetrie* (1591). All these three writers emphasize the moral lessons of tragedy and comedy on the familiar humanist lines.

It must be admitted that the humanist theory was not altogether conclusive as an answer to the Puritans. These were not prepared to accept the authority of Horace as making delight, even in conjunction with the useful, a legitimate end, when, as they pointed out, the delight was a carnal and not a spiritual one.[1] Nor could the arguments in favour of decorum, which were wholly of a literary and not an ethical nature, be expected to appeal to them. And as to the moral lessons to be learned by witnessing plays, whether tragedies or comedies, they were entirely sceptical. They return again and again, with obvious irritation, to the probably mythical story of a good woman who swore by her troth that she had been as much edified at a play as at any sermon.[2]

> If, says Northbrooke, you will learne howe to bee false and deceyue your husbandes, or husbandes their wyues, howe to playe the harlottes, to obtayne ones loue, howe to rauishe, howe to beguyle, howe to betraye, to flatter, lye, sweare, forsweare, howe to allure to whoredome, howe to murther, howe to poyson, howe to disobey and rebell against princes, to consume treasures prodigally, to mooue to lustes, to ransacke and spoyle cities and townes, to bee ydle, to blaspheme, to sing filthie songes of loue, to speake filthily, to be prowde, howe to mocke, scoffe and deryde any nation . . . shall not you learne, then, at such enterludes howe to practise them.[3]

And if sometimes notorious evil-doers are held up to reprobation on the stage, it seems to the preachers that such rebuke might more suitably come from the pulpit, since in a theatre the appeal must needs be made to an audience hardly fit to be judges in any man's cause.[4] Gosson and Munday, having

[1] Gosson, *P. C.* 203.
[2] Northbrooke, 92; Munday, 139; Stubbes, 143.
[3] Northbrooke, 92; cf. Stubbes, 144.
[4] Munday, 150.

been playwrights, and having presumably suffered at the hands of their masters, pay off old scores with another argument. If plays had really a moral influence, would not this be apparent in the lives of those who are most conversant with them, the players themselves. Yet the players are not only extremely insolent and swaggering persons, but notoriously practise in real life the very vices which they represent on the stage. Moreover, they take young boys and bring them up in shamelessness. How can it be expected that good shall be done, where there is no will in the agent to do good?[1] The inconclusiveness of the discussion was of course largely due to the fact that the Puritan and the humanist disputants were not talking about quite the same thing. Obviously the influence of a play, if any, upon conduct must depend on the manner of handling and on the dramatic idea involved; and it may be taken for granted that the ideal comedy and tragedy, which the humanists praised and which some of them tried to realize, were often very imperfectly represented by the actual pieces put before a London audience. This is to some extent admitted on both sides. Sidney is frankly contemptuous of the popular stage. Whetstone speaks of his 'commendable exercise' as 'discredited with the tryfels of yonge, unadvised, and rashe witted wryters'. Lodge and the author of *The Play of Plays* are fully conscious of abuses, which must be remedied if the drama is to take the place assigned to it in the humanist scheme of things. On the other hand, Gosson is fair-minded enough to admit that certain plays, principally his own, are beyond reproach; and even that, as compared with an earlier period than that of which he wrote, there had been some purging of the language used on the boards.[2] Yet, when all allowance has been made on this score, it would seem that there must still remain some fundamental incompatibility between the views of the Puritans and those of the humanists as regards the psychological effects of the drama upon conduct. Perhaps this is hardly to be wondered at. After all, the psychological effect of a drama, or of any other work of art, is not a simple thing, but depends upon an incalculable relation between what the artist puts into his work and what the spectator brings to the contemplation of it. And it may fairly be assumed that what a Sidney brought and what a limb of Limehouse brought were sufficiently different things. Were this a philosophic work on the drama and not merely a history of the stage, it might be appropriate to dwell upon the fact that, however much the Puritans and the humanists might disagree, they

[1] Gosson, *P. C.* 182; Munday, 147. [2] Gosson, *S. A.* 37.

were at one in referring their judgement of the drama to purely ethical standards of value, and that the conception of aesthetic value, which means so much for modern thought, was in the main beyond the scope of Elizabethan criticism.

So far as the character of the particular plays put on the stage was material, the case for the defence grew stronger as these approached more nearly to literature. Thus Thomas Nashe, whose *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication* (1592) contains by far the most effective of the apologies for the drama from a popular point of view, is in a position, not only to vaunt the respectability of English actors as compared with the 'squirting baudie comedians' of beyond the seas, to repudiate the idea that rowdy apprentices were wanted in the theatres at all, and to claim a distinct superiority for play-going over gaming, whoreing and drinking as a pastime for courtiers and other idle men; but also to give point to his glorification of the moral purpose of tragedy and comedy by a special reference to the chronicle plays then at the height of their success, 'wherein our forefathers valiant acts, that haue line long buried in rustie brasse and worme-eaten bookes, are reuiued, and they themselues raised from the graue of obliuion, and brought to pleade their aged honours in open presence; than which, what can be a sharper reproofe to these degenerate, effeminate dayes of ours?' Nashe can even illustrate his contention from the Talbot scenes of Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*; and it is indeed the ultimate paradox of the Puritan controversy that a movement, which was undoubtedly designed in the interests of honest and clean living, would have had the result, if it had been successful, of shutting out the world from the possibilities of a Shakespeare.

After the publication of the *Anatomie of Abuses* in 1583 there was some slackening in the literary warfare carried on by the Puritans. The duty of abstinence from plays becomes a commonplace of treatises on morals and devotion, and the preachers continue to complain, but the only specialist pamphlet during the next quarter of a century is the comparatively unimportant *Mirrour of Monsters* (1587) by another cast playwright, William Rankins. It must be doubtful whether this was due to any decrease in the strength of the sentiment against the stage. But the trial of forces was over, and for a time there was little further advance to be made. Something, as will be seen in the next chapter, had been won, so far as the observance of Sunday was concerned; on the other hand, the main issue had been pretty definitely lost. Moreover, there were other things to be thought of;

firstly the Martin Marprelate controversy, which for a while absorbed much ink and paper, and secondly, the persecution which recusants had to undergo at the hands of the dominant party in Church and State. Aggressive at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, by its close Puritanism had to stand on its defence. A corresponding change in its relations with the stage was inevitable. From an assailant, it became an object of assault. The players had never been disposed to endure criticism without hitting back. Lewis Wager, as early as 1566, has his word against the hypocrites, who slander plays from fear lest their own wickedness should be revealed in public; and one may be sure that the actor's side of the question was as remorselessly pressed from the scaffold as that of the Puritan from the pulpit. This tendency can only have gathered impetus from the official encouragement given for a time to the players to intervene against Martin Marprelate.[1] The tone of the later apologists for the stage has become insolent rather than deprecatory. Nashe, always ready to carry any war into the enemy's quarter, boldly ascribes the attacks upon plays to the envy felt by vintners, alewives, and victuallers for more respectable places of entertainment than their own, and to the indifference to greatness of avaricious citizens, who 'know when they are dead they shall not be brought upon the stage for any goodness, but in a merriment of the Usurer and the Diuel, or buying Armes of the Herald'. So, too, Henry Chettle, in his *Kind-Harts Dreame* (1592), puts into the mouth of the ghost of Tarleton, not only the usual serious defence of the moral value of plays and an appeal to the youth of the city not to disturb the peace of the theatres, but also a mock protest from the keepers of bowling-alleys, dicing-houses, and brothels against the competition of actors with their trades, and the discovery in jig and jest of 'our crosse-biting, our conny-catching, our traines, our traps, our gins, our snares, our subtilties'. Nashe and Chettle are perhaps tilting rather at some of the civic allies of the Puritans, than at the Puritans themselves. But the latter had to bear their full share of the stage's revengeful triumph. The printer of *Th' Overthrow of Stage Playes* in 1599 notes in his preface how some 'haue not bene afraied of late dayes to bring vpon the stage the very sober countenances, graue attire, modest and matronelike gestures & speaches of men & women to be laughed at as a scorne and reproch to the world'. A detailed analysis of the satire of Puritanism in later Elizabethan and in Jacobean comedy would pass beyond the limits of this study. For a sample

[1] Cf. ch. ix and App. C, No. xl.

may be taken the figure of Rabbi Zeal-of-the-Land Busy in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614). Busy has a scruple against eating pig at the fair, 'for the very calling it a *Bartholmew*-pigge, and to eat it so, is a spice of *Idolatry*, and you make the *Fayre*, no better than one of the high *Places*'. But the lust of the flesh overcomes him, and he eats 'two and a half to his share' and drinks 'a pailefull'. This, however, does not dispose him to be lenient to the pride of the eyes at the fair. He condemns a doll with 'See you not Goldylocks, the purple strumpet, there? in her yellow gowne, and greene sleeues?' and pulls down a pile of gingerbread cakes as 'this idolatrous groue of images, this flasket of idols'. Naturally, his extreme wrath is against the puppet, which he calls Dagon, and 'a beame in the eye of the brethren; a very great beame, an exceeding great beame; such as are your *Stage-players*, *Rimers*, and *Morrise-dancers*, who have walked hand in hand, in contempt of the *Brethren*, and the *Cause*'. He disputes with the puppet, and produces the 'old stale argument' of the male putting on the apparel of the female and the female of the male, and is finally refuted when the puppet 'takes up his garment', and reveals that it has no sex.[1]

When Puritanism gathered head again under James, it was the sting of caricature which directly led to the renewal of the old controversy. Two hypocrites in *The Puritan* (*c.* 1606) had been christened after the churches of St. Antholin and St. Mary Overies, which were known to be the principal centres in London of Puritan faith and practice. William Crashaw, the father of the poet, protested in a sermon at Paul's Cross. Two years later, he again rebuked the players for their opposition to the Virginian expedition, which he declared to be due to pique at the godly determination of the adventurers to take no company to their plantation. There were other 'seditious sectists' at work, and a leading actor of the Queen's men, who was also a prolific dramatist, Thomas Heywood, took up the cudgels for his 'quality' against these 'over-curious heads' in an elaborate *Apology for Actors*, which must have been written about 1608, but was not published until 1612. This resumes, effectively enough, most of the arguments both of the humanists and of popular disputants such as Nashe, but does not contribute anything very novel upon a subject as to which, indeed, little novel remained to be said, with the exception of a

[1] *B. Fair*, i. 2, 3, 6; iii. 2, 6; iv. 1, 6; v. 5; cf. Jonson's *Epigr.* lxxv, *On Lippe the Teacher*. I suppose that the treatise on the question of sex-apparel which Selden sent to Jonson in 1616 (App. C, No. lxii) was meant to furnish annotations for *B. Fair*.

reminder to the preachers that, whatever the Fathers may have thought about the Roman *ludi*, nothing had been said against them by either Christ or his Apostles.[1] Heywood dwells, of course, upon the established position to which by his time actors had attained in the favour both of English and of foreign sovereigns. But he is not blind to the abuses of his profession, and while lauding many of his fellows as men ' of substance, of government, of sober lives and temperate carriages, house-keepers, and contributory to all duties enjoyned them ', regrets the licentiousness of others, as well as a growing tendency to inveigh upon the stage both against ' the state, the court, the law, the citty ', and against ' private men's humors '.[2] Heywood was answered by one I. G. in *A Refutation of the Apologie for Actors* (1615), which in its turn covered much ground already trod; and a year later another actor, Nathan Field, was moved to a *Remonstrance* by some personal attacks levelled at himself and the rest of the King's men by Thomas Sutton, minister of St. Mary Overies. This brings us to the limit of the Shakespearian period, and in the distance still lie the final and portentous presentation of the whole Puritan case in Prynne's *Histriomastix* (1633), the closing of the theatres by the Long Parliament, and the reaction of the Restoration under which men looked back to the stage of James and Charles as a model of decency and order.[3]

There is one clear heritage of English Puritanism from the Genevan theocracy, and that is the claim of the ministers, not only to direct the consciences of their flocks, but also to call upon the municipal authorities to put down with the might of the secular arm whatever in the life of the community did not conform to the religious and ethical standards which they preached. Most of the sermons and pamphlets of 1576–83 are quite deliberately addressed to the ' magistrate ', with a view to the exercise of the regulative powers conferred by the proclamation of 1559 and the statute of 1572 for the remedy of the abuses of playhouses, and if possible to the complete suppression of playing. The City fathers, although Gosson railed against their ' sleepiness ', were by no means deaf to these appeals.[4] Many of them had themselves adopted Puritanic principles. And apart from strictly religious considerations, they had their own reasons for looking with disfavour upon plays. They were husbands and employers, and their wives and apprentices wasted both time and money in gadding abroad to theatres, at a risk to their virtue and

[1] Heywood, 24.
[2] Heywood, 43, 61.
[3] Cf. App. J.
[4] Gosson, *P. C.* 211.

even their honesty. They were dignitaries, and were not invariably treated with respect upon the boards. They were the health authority, and even if plays did not stir the divine wrath to send a plague or an earthquake, the crowded assemblies certainly helped to spread infection, and the rickety structures brought hazard to life and limb.[1] They were responsible for the maintenance of law and order, and plays were not only the occasions for frays and riots, but also brought bad characters together, and were suspected of affording secret opportunities for the hatching of sedition. It must be borne in mind that, so far as the external abuses of theatres go, the complaints of their bitterest enemies are fairly well supported by independent evidence. The presence of improper persons in the theatres is amply testified to by the satirists, and by references in the plays themselves.[2] Intrigues and other nefarious transactions were carried on there[3]; and careful mothers, such as Lady Bacon, anxiously entreated their sons to choose more salutary neighbourhoods for their lodgings.[4] Some serious disturbances of the peace of which theatres were the centres will require attention in the next chapter, while law-court and other records preserve the memory of both grave crimes and minor misdemeanours of which they were the scenes.[5] Like the bawdy-houses, they

[1] Henslowe, i. 136, records a payment of 10*s.* by the Admiral's in May 1601, 'to geatte the boye into the ospetalle which was hurt at the Fortewne'. At St. James, Clerkenwell, was buried on 26 May 1613 (*Harl. Soc.* xvii. 123) 'John Brittine y^t^ was killed with a fall in the Pley howse'. There was a shooting accident also in an Admiral's play of 1587; cf. ch. xiii.

[2] Cf. ch. xviii.

[3] One of the charges brought against the Venetian ambassador Foscarini on his return to Venice in 1616 was that he had tried to seduce the penitent of an English religious attached to the embassy, 'sometimes attending the public comedies and standing among the people on the chance of seeing her' (*Venetian Papers*, xiv. 593). About 1594 a diamond stolen from the loot of a Spanish carrack was bought by some goldsmiths from a mariner whom they met by chance 'at a play in the theatre at Shoreditch', and who afterwards showed them the diamond in Finsbury Fields (*Cecil Papers*, vii. 504).

[4] Cf. ch. xvi, s.v. Bull.

[5] In *Stukeley*, 610, the hero owes the bailiff of Finsbury, 'for frays and bloodshed in the Theatre fields, five marks'. The Middlesex justices had to deal with cases of stealing a purse at the Curtain in 1600, of a 'notable outrage' at the Red Bull in 1610, of abusing gentlemen at the Fortune in 1611, of stealing a purse at the Red Bull in 1613, and of stabbing at the Fortune in 1613 (*Middlesex County Records*, i. 205, 217, 259; ii. xlvii, 64, 71, 86, 88). On 7 July 1602 James wrote from Scotland to one James Hudson to intercede with the Council for John Henslay or Henchelawe of Grimsby, who was assaulted by Nicholas Blinstoun or Blunston at a play about the previous Whitsunday (23 May), and slew him (*Scottish Papers*, ii. 815; *Hatfield MSS.* xii. 363). Dekker (ii. 326), in *Jests to*

appear to have been at the mercy of the traditional rowdiness of the prentices on Shrove Tuesday.[1]

On divers grounds therefore the Corporation of London seem to have reached the conclusion, about 1582 if not before, that the only way to reform the theatres was to end them. Probably they were influenced by the views of some of their permanent officials, of whom Thomas Norton, Remembrancer from 1571 to 1584, although himself a part-author of the tragedy of *Gorboduc*, and William Fleetwood, Recorder from 1571 to 1594, are known to have been determined opponents of the stage. The voluminous reports on city affairs, which Fleetwood was in the habit of sending to Lord Burghley, add much to our knowledge of a critical period.[2] Had the matter rested wholly with the Corporation, the policy of prohibition

Make you Merrie (1607), gives the private playhouse as the habitat of the 'foist' or pickpocket, and says, 'The times when his skirmishes are hottest, or ye time when they run attilt, is . . . a new play'. Again (iii. 158), in *The Belman of London* (1608), he tells us that rogues haunt playhouses, and (iii. 212) in *Lanthorne and Candlelight* (1609), 'A foyst nor a nip shall not walke into a fayre or a Play-house, but euerie cracke will cry looke to your purses'.

[1] Divers persons were slain and others hurt and wounded in an attempt to pull down the Cockpit in Drury Lane on Shrove Tuesday 1617 (*M. S. C.* i. 374); cf. Camden, *Annales* (4 March 1617), 'Theatrum ludionum nuper erectum in Drury-Lane a furente multitudine diruitur, et apparatus dilaceratur'; John Taylor, *Jack a Lent* (1620, ed. Hindley), 'Put play houses to the sack and bawdy houses to the spoil'; *The Owles Almanack* (1618), 9, 'Shroue-tuesday falls on that day, on which the prentices plucked downe the cocke-pit, and on which they did alwayes vse to rifle Madam *Leakes* house, at the vpper end of *Shorditch*'. This was not Puritanism, but a traditional Saturnalia of apprentices at Shrovetide; cf. Earle, *Microcosmography*, char. 64 (A Player), 'Shrove-tuesday he feares as much as the bawdes'; Busino, *Anglopotrida* (1618, *V. P.* xv. 246), describing the bands of prentices, 3,000 or 4,000 strong, who on Shrove Tuesday and 1 May do outrages in all directions, especially the suburbs, where they destroy houses of correction; E. Gayton, *Festivous Notes upon Don Quixote* (1654), 271, 'I have known upon one of these festivals, but especially at Shrove-tide, where the players have been appointed, notwithstanding their bills to the contrary, to act what the major part of the company had a mind to. Sometimes *Tamerlane*, sometimes *Jugurtha*, sometimes *The Jew of Malta*, and sometimes parts of all these; and at last, none of the three taking, they were forced to undress and put off their tragick habits, and conclude the day with *The Merry Milkmaides*. And unless this were done, and the popular humour satisfied (as sometimes it so fortun'd that the players were refractory), the benches, the tiles, the laths, the stones, oranges, apples, nuts, flew about most liberally; and as there were mechanicks of all professions, who fell every one to his trade, and dissolved a house in an instant, and made a ruin of a stately fabric'.

[2] Most of these letters are printed in Wright, *Eliz.*; a few are still unprinted among the *Lansdowne* and *Hatfield MSS.*; cf. App. D, Nos. xxxv, xxxvii, lxxiv.

would doubtless have been brought into effective operation. But it did not rest wholly with them. Not only were the most important theatres, from 1576, outside the limits of their jurisdiction, but also account had to be taken of an authority greater even than that of the City of London, the authority, ill-defined but imperative, of the Privy Council. And the Privy Council was, as a rule, swayed by principles and personalities by no means enamoured of prohibition. Of this the anti-stage pamphleteers show themselves fully conscious. Gosson, addressing his *Schoole of Abuse* to the Lord Mayor for the time being, acknowledges the difficulties which the 'letters of commendations' held by the companies put in the way of reform, and laments that players share the natures of the cuttle-fish and the torpedo, so that 'how many nets so euer ther be layde to take them, or hookes to choke them, they haue ynke in their bowels to darken the water, and sleights in their budgets, to dry up the arme of euery magistrate'. In *Playes Confuted*, he prayed for 'some noble Scipio in the courte' to drive the 'daunsing chaplines of Bacchus' out of England, and in a prefatory epistle to Sir Francis Walsingham he declared that the cleansing of the Augean stable was only possible for 'some Hercules in the court, whom the roare of the enimy can never daunt'. No doubt he hoped that the combined functions of a Scipio and of a Hercules would be undertaken by Walsingham himself.[1] Anthony Munday is even more explicit. He urges the city not to be daunted by 'particular men of auctoritie', and inveighs against the nobility who 'restraine the magistrates from executing their office', in order to pleasure servants whom they are unwilling to maintain themselves, and therefore license to roam throughout the country, publishing their 'mametree' in every temple of God, and begging alms in their masters' names from house to house.[2] The Council, however, were by no means disposed to give the City a free hand, and with themselves the policy of prohibition made little headway. They had, indeed, to reconcile conflicting considerations. They too, like the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, feared the opportunities for riots and seditions which the theatres afforded;[3] and the danger of the spread of plague was their constant preoccupation. Moreover, they were especially concerned to see that the players did not touch upon matters of state or religion, and to visit with sharp

[1] Gosson, *S. A.* 56; *P. C.* Epistle, 178. [2] Munday, 128.

[3] Occasionally players were of use as spies. On 30 March 1603 four players gave information of an alleged proclamation of Lord Beauchamp as king by Lord Southampton (*Hist. MSS.* xiii. 4. 126).

chastisement any offences in these directions. They frequently, therefore, thought it well to intervene with temporary inhibitions of plays, particularly during hot summers when the anticipations of plague were at their greatest. But they were never prepared to assent to the chronic request of the City that these inhibitions should be made permanent. After all, the people must have their recreation, and, what was more, the Queen must have hers.[1] And if her majesty's 'solace' at Christmas was to be provided upon economical terms, it was necessary that the players should be allowed facilities for 'exercise', and incidentally for earning their living, through public performances.[2] In a sense, therefore, it was really the Court play which saved the popular stage, and enabled the companies to establish themselves in a position which neither preachers nor aldermen could shake. One may suppose that the members of the Privy Council did not all quite see eye to eye on the theatrical question; and there were occasional fluctuations of policy which caused alarm in the tiring-rooms. Even in the high quarters where the natural attitude to the drama was that of humanism, Puritan sympathies were sometimes to be found. Leicester, indeed, who frequently curried favour with the Puritans, failed them in this respect, as may be seen from a letter written in 1581 by John Field, minister of the word of God, and author of an *Exhortation* on the fall of Paris Garden, in which he rebukes Leicester for his patronage of plays 'to the great greife of all the godly'.[3] Burghley may have been personally inclined to the views of his friend and correspondent William Fleetwood, although even at the end of his long life he had not forgotten the services of the stage to his earlier statecraft.[4] It was to Walsingham that Gosson

[1] Cf. App. D, Nos. xl, liii, lviii, lxxi, lxxiii, lxxv, lxxxiv, lxxxv, ci, cxiv. The notion of the need of the public, as distinct from that of the Queen, for dramatic recreation gradually makes its appearance (cf. especially App. D, No. cii); but imperial Rome might have taught its lesson of *panem et circenses*.

[2] Taylor, *Wit and Mirth* (1629, Hazlitt, *Jest Books*, iii. 62), burlesques the point of view in a story of the visit of the Queen's ape to Looe in Cornwall. The showman approached the mayor, who did visit and 'put off his hat and made a leg', and there was a proclamation, 'These are to will and require you, and every of you, with your wives and families, that upon the sight hereof, you make your personall appearance before the Queenes Ape, for it is an Ape of ranke and quality, who is to bee practised through her Majesties dominions, that by his long experience amongst her loving subjects, hee may bee the better enabled to doe her majesty service hereafter; and hereof faile you not, as you will answer the contrary'.

[3] App. D, No. liv.

[4] Hawarde, 48, records that in a Star Chamber case of cozening on 18 June 1596 'The Lord Treasurer would haue those y^t^ make the playes

looked as a Scipio and a Hercules in the dedication of his *Playes Confuted* in 1583, but Gosson was unlucky in his dedications, and in the following year Walsingham was officially concerned in the formation of the company of Queen's players. One would gladly know who was the ' notable wise counseller ' dead in 1591, who, according to Sir John Harington, stood up for the play of *The Cards*, against those who thought that it was ' somewhat too plaine '. I should not be surprised if this were Walsingham.[1] By virtue of their offices, the Lord Chamberlain and Vice-Chamberlain, who were responsible for Court entertainments, were almost bound to take the players' part. But there was a moment of trepidation when Lord Cobham, who was known to be touched with Puritanism, succeeded for a few months in 1596 the ' old lord ', Henry Lord Hunsdon, on whom the companies had learnt to rely. There is nothing to show that Elizabeth, beyond holding out for her ' solace ', took any personal interest in the controversy. That very irritating document, the *Acts of the Privy Council*, which is little more than a letter-book, does not record whether she was present or not at the Council meetings at which theatrical affairs were discussed. But it must be assumed that the general attitude of the Council had her concurrence. Certainly she had no Puritan tendencies, and on the rare occasions on which her interference can be traced she was acting in the interests of one or other favoured company.[2]

to make a comedie hereof, & to acte it with these names ' ; cf. p. 244. In *Hatfield MSS.* vii. 270 is a ' lewd saucy letter ' of 25 June 1597 from Sir John Hollis to Burghley, who on the last Star Chamber day had pronounced Hollis's great-grandfather ' an abominable usurer, a merchant of broken paper, so hateful and contemptible a creature that the players acted him before the King [Henry VII or VIII] with great applause '. It is printed in H. Walpole, *Royal and Noble Authors* (ed. Park, ii. 283).

[1] App. C, No. xlv. Was this the Chapel *Game of the Cards* on 26 Dec. 1582, or was it the play in which Tarlton (cf. ch. xv) glanced at Raleigh as the knave commanding the queen ?

[2] These interventions were the Admiral's men in 1600 and for Oxford's and Worcester's men in 1602 (cf. App. D, Nos. cxvii, cxxx).

IX

THE STRUGGLE OF COURT AND CITY

[*Bibliographical Note.*—Most of the material for the present chapter is collected in Appendix D. An outline of the subject was given in *Tudor Revels* (1906), and it is well and fully treated in V. C. Gildersleeve, *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama* (1908). G. M. G., *The Stage Censor* (1908), and F. Fowell and F. Palmer, *Censorship in England* (1913), are perhaps more valuable on later periods. Vagabond life and legislation may be studied in G. Nicholls, *History of the English Poor Law*[2] (1898), C. J. Ribton-Turner, *History of Vagrants and Vagrancy* (1887), E. M. Leonard, *Early History of English Poor Relief* (1900), and F. Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (1913), and the working of local government in C. A. Beard, *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England* (1904), and E. Trotter, *Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish* (1919).]

The foregoing chapter has endeavoured to define the practical and spiritual forces which underlay the controversy between Puritanism and the stage; it remains to study the working of the constitutional forms through which, as a resultant of those forces, the 'quality' of the player ultimately established itself as a recognized constituent of the polity. And first, for the social status of the players. The wittier Puritans were fond of twitting them, on the ground that, if all men had their rights, they would count as no better than vagabonds. There is little more than a verbal truth in the taunt. No doubt, in certain circumstances, players, like minstrels before them, might fall within the danger of a series of statutes which, in the course of formulating the provisions of a nascent poor-law, attempted also to regulate the wandering elements of society. It was part of the mediaeval conception of things to assign to every individual a definite function in the social organism and to expect from him the regular fulfilment of that function. To such a theory the migratory beggar and the masterless man were naturally repugnant. But it was primarily a shortage of labour towards the end of the fourteenth century which brought about the first serious endeavour to check vagabondage by legislation, and to compel the able-bodied vagrant, through the machinery of local government, to return to the village of his domicile and there take up again the service which he had abandoned. This policy was continued and developed by the Tudors. The principal act which was operative, when Elizabeth came to

the throne, had been passed under Henry VIII in 1531. It provided that any able-bodied beggar or idle vagrant, having no land or master, and using no lawful merchandise, craft, or mystery for his living, should be brought before a justice of the peace, or in a corporate town the mayor, who should see him whipped at the cart-tail, and then, if a beggar, returned to his place of birth or residence, there to work as a true man ought to do, or if an idle person but no beggar, either put to labour or set in the stocks until he found surety to go to service. This statute was replaced by one of greater severity in 1547, under which vagabonds were to be branded and put to forced labour as slaves. But it was revived in 1550 and kept in force by frequent renewals, of which the last was under Elizabeth herself in 1563. In these Acts there is no mention by name either of players or of minstrels.[1] It may, however, be assumed that the quality of a player would no more be regarded than that of a tinker or a pedlar as a merchandise, craft or mystery, and the fact that some of the early companies were composed of men for whom playing had originally been subsidiary to a regular craft would hardly serve them, after they had obviously deserted that craft and were travelling abroad to make a living by the arts of migratory entertainment.[2] Their actual safeguard was quite a different one. By definition the vagabond was a masterless man, and with the exception of a few bodies of town players, who probably did not wander far from their settled habitations, the Tudor companies were not masterless. They were all under the protection of some nobleman or gentleman of position, as whose 'servants' they passed, bearing with them, no doubt, at any rate after this was required by a proclamation of 1554, a 'certificate' or letter of recommendation as proof of identity.[3] No doubt the relation in the larger companies

[1] Aydelotte, 58, misrepresents the Act of 1531 on this point. The clearest proof that the unprotected player was a vagabond is in a Privy Council letter of 30 April 1556 to Lord Shrewsbury (Lodge, i. 260), which, after directing that Sir Francis Leek shall not let his servants travel as players, adds, 'And in case any person shall attempt to set forth these sort of games or pastimes at any time hereafter, contrary to this order; and do wander, for that purpose, abroad in the country; your Lordship shall do well to give the Justices of the Peace in charge to see them apprehended out of hand, and punished as vagabonds, by virtue of the statute made against loitering and idle persons'.

[2] Cf. App. C, s.vv. Gosson (1582), 215; Cox (1591); App. D, No. lxxv (2) (*b*). An Act of 1552 (*5 & 6 Edw. VI*, c. 21) required every travelling 'Pedler, Tynker, or Pety Chapman' to have a licence from two justices of the shire in which he resided (*Statutes*, iv. 155). This was merged in the Act of 1572 (App. D, No. xxiv), but not formally repealed until *1 Jac. I*, c. 25, in 1604 (*Statutes*, iv. 1052).

[3] *Procl.* 455; cf. Dasent, v. 73; Machyn, 69.

of lord and servants was little more than a nominal one. The strict regulations of Henry VII against retainers who were not household servants had become relaxed with the disappearance of the conditions which necessitated them.[1] The players would wear a livery or badge, and would do some courtesy of attendance on festival occasions. The lord might intervene to help them if they got into an undeserved difficulty, and would see to it that they did not bring his name into bad repute. There was no economic dependence; the players lived by their earnings, not by wages. But they were not reckoned as masterless men.

A secure status, however, did not mean complete absence of control. The players had no free hand to play just when and where and what they liked. They were subject to certain conveniences as to times and seasons and localities, to precautions against breaches of the peace and dangers to public health and safety. Above all, in a time of political and ecclesiastical ferment, the sentiments of their plays had to be such as would stand the scrutiny of a government by no means tolerant of criticism. On these matters it was not, except in so far as heresy was constituted by Acts of Uniformity and the like, with statutes that they had to deal, but with the administrative regulations of the local and central executives. All over the country there were bodies charged with a general responsibility for public order, public safety, and public decency, as the Elizabethans conceived it. In the rural districts there were the justices of the peace, with powers more considerable than clearly defined; in the towns there were mayors and corporations, also acting as justices, but armed with a further authority derived both from custom and from charters, and with a very clear intention to use this authority to the full in the government of their communities. The regulation of amusements had always been regarded as falling within the scope of municipal activity, and in the end it proved a fortunate thing for the players, in London at any rate, that the central authority found itself driven by the pressure of circumstances to take over a large measure of the responsibility for stage control from the hands of the corporations.

For it need hardly be said that in the Tudor scheme of

[1] Cf. *M. S. C.* i. 350; Aydelotte, 14. *Procl.* 273 laid down (1545) 'that noe person of what estate, degree or condicion soever he be, doe in any wise hereafter name or avowe any man to be his servant, unles he be his houshold servant, or his bailiffe or keeper, or such other as he may keepe and retayne by the lawes and statutes of this realme, or be retayned by the kings maiestys licence' (Hazlitt, *E. D. S.* 7). But the laws against retainers had fallen into desuetude again by 1572; cf. App. D, No. xix.

things the power of the local authorities was an immediate rather than an ultimate one. Both the justices of the peace and, for all their charters, the corporations had to reckon with a considerable and growing measure of central control, resting upon the royal prerogative, and claiming not merely to further define, but also in some respects to replace, dispense with, or override legislative enactments. This development of regulation from the centre is, of course, an established feature of sixteenth-century history. It arose out of many convergent causes, the strength of the monarchy in face of the great houses weakened by civil contention, the personal qualities of the Tudor sovereigns, the urgent need of fresh machinery to deal with problems created by ecclesiastical changes, by the growth of the press, by the growth of the stage itself, for which the legal and administrative traditions of the Middle Ages provided no solution. And if it was largely unconstitutional and destined ultimately to bring the prerogative to perdition, this did not in the meantime affect the position of the actor, who would certainly be fined and imprisoned if he did not obey, or to any great extent that of the justices or corporations, who might prove recalcitrant or at least argumentative, but in the long run found it profitable to obey also. There were three main avenues through which the royal prerogative found exercise. The first of these was the ancient procedure of Chancery. The will of the sovereign might be expressed in a writ or mandate, directed to the subject, and stamped for greater solemnity with the impression of the Great Seal of England. Such a writ was generally used in granting licences, in conferring offices, or in issuing commissions to execute functions on behalf of the Crown. It took the form of letters patent, so called because they were intended as open communications to all whom they might concern. These were handed to the recipient after an elaborate diplomatic process during which they passed successively under the royal Sign Manual, the Signet, the Privy Seal, and the Great Seal itself, while a copy was enrolled in the Court of Chancery, and thus became matter of public record.[1]

[1] Scargill-Bird[3], 80; W. R. Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, ii. 1. 55; H. Hall, *Studies in English Official Historical Documents*, 263; *M. S. C.* i. 260. The stages of a patent, as settled by *27 Hen. VIII*, c. 11 (1535), were (*a*) a Petition setting out the grant desired, and (*b*) a direction by the Sovereign for the preparation of (*c*) a King's Bill. In this the wording of the intended patent was settled, and this wording was followed, with varying initial and final *formulae*, in the subsequent instruments. The King's Bill received the royal Sign Manual and became the authority for the issue by a Clerk to the Signet of (*d*) a Signet Bill. This was sent to the Lord Privy Seal, who based upon it (*e*) a Writ of Privy Seal, which

Secondly, there was the proclamation. This was in theory the formal announcement either of an executive act, or of the royal intention as to the enforcement or interpretation of a statute. In practice it tended more and more, during the Tudor period, itself to take the place of a statutory enactment. Proclamations were made by direction of the sovereign in council, and were enrolled, like the patents, in Chancery. Both proclamations and, at a comparatively late stage, patents were made use of in the process of regulating players. But they were largely supplemented by the third method through which the royal prerogative expressed itself, namely that day-by-day activity of the Privy Council in the general co-ordination and supervision of affairs, which has already been described.[1] The Council Register itself and the local archives, especially those of London, are full of letters from head-quarters to justices and corporations, directing them as to the allowance or inhibition of plays in general, or calling for special action in cases in which a company of players had provoked a breach of the peace or had brought themselves under suspicion of heresy or sedition. No doubt the corporations, in particular, would often have preferred to act upon their own discretion. Sometimes they argued or protested or deferred compliance. But the Council had the powers of the Star Chamber behind them; and if in the end they resorted to more direct ways of control, this was probably rather for the sake of avoiding administrative friction than because they found any ultimate difficulty in imposing their will by means of correspondence upon reluctant magistrates.

It was, of course, until plague and Puritanism became serious preoccupations, with the subject-matter of plays, rather than the details of times and places, that the central government mainly concerned itself; and it was apparently the disturbed ecclesiastical position of the later years of Henry VIII that directed attention to the drama as a subject of state instead of merely local concern. I have dealt elsewhere with the encouragement given to controversial interludes by Cromwell and Cranmer, with the swing of the pendulum when the controversialists began to apply themselves, not merely to points of church government which Henry desired to alter, but with heresies which he was not prepared

was addressed to the Lord Chancellor, and became in its turn the authority for the issue of (*f*) the actual Letters Patent under the Great Seal. These were handed to the recipient, while the Writ of Privy Seal passed on to the Six Clerks in Chancery, for (*g*) an Enrolment of its contents upon the Patent Roll.

[1] Cf. ch. ii.

to adopt, and with the proclamations and counter-proclamations and the interventions by the Privy Council to which the problem gave rise under Edward VI and Mary.[1] Some additional material which has more recently been published throws light upon the regulative functions of the City of London in particular during 1549 and 1550.[2] More than once the prevalence of 'lewd' and 'naughty' plays on this side or that led to the complete inhibition of all performances for a season. There is also some trace of a system of licences for particular companies. It is not clear why Lord Dorset should have thought it necessary to obtain a special authorization from the Council for his men to play in his presence only in 1551.[3] A forged licence taken from some players and sent to Sir William Cecil in 1552 may perhaps have purported to have been nothing more than such a certificate from a lord as was required by the proclamation of 1554.[4] Two general conclusions may be drawn from these early records. One is that, although the local authorities were certainly responsible for the regulation of plays as a matter of public order, they were not always in a position to make their control effective without an appeal to head-quarters. The performances were popular and the players had inherited from the minstrels a prescriptive right to municipal encouragement and reward, rather than interference. And if they bore the badge of some great personage, himself perhaps a privy councillor, one may be sure that Dogberry and Verges would think twice before they ventured on a rebuff. Even in London the Lord Mayor had to appeal to the Privy Council in 1543 to get certain joiners imprisoned and reprimanded for playing on a Sunday.[5] And if this was so in London, where the Lord Mayor had certainly a firm seat in his saddle, it was naturally still more so in the county areas, whose looser methods of government ultimately proved to have a very marked significance for the history of the London theatres. The

[1] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 216. [2] Cf. App. D, Nos. ii–v.

[3] Dasent, iii. 307.

[4] *S. P. D. Edw. VI*, xv. 33. By *5 & 6 Edw. VI* of 1552 (*Statutes*, iv. 155) travelling tinkers and pedlars could hold a licence from two justices of the peace. This arrangement is continued by the Act of 1572 (*vide infra*), and tinkers and pedlars are there grouped with players. Possibly therefore such local licences had also been issued to players who were not 'servants', even before 1572.

[5] Dasent, i. 104, 109, 110, 122. The nature of the joiners' offence is clear; three of those imprisoned were named Hawtrell, Lucke, and Lucas. They had played 'wythowt respect ether off the day or the ordre whiche was knowen openlye the Kinges Highnes intended to take for repressinge off playes'. At the same time the Lord Warden's men were committed 'for playing contrary to an ordre taken by the Mayour'.

weak position of the Surrey justices, for example, is illustrated by a letter from Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, to Sir William Paget, Secretary of State, written on 5 February 1547, shortly after the death of Henry VIII. He asks that Paget or the Protector will intervene to prevent Lord Oxford's men, who have threatened ' to try who shall have most resort, they in game or I in earnest ', from giving a play in Southwark at the moment when he sings his *Dirige* for the dead king ; and he reports that one Master Acton, a justice of the peace, has attempted to stop the assembly, but the players ' smally regard ' him, and ' press him to a peremptory answer, whether he dare lett them play or not ; whereunto he answereth neither yea nor nay as to the playing '.[1]

The second point is that, although the Privy Council might intervene to help the magistrates, their own primary interest at this time was in the exclusion of heresy and sedition from plays. This shows itself in two ways. Individual plays are brought before the Council itself, and lead to disciplinary measures. But there is also the germ of a censorship. At first it is exercised through the local authorities. The London aldermen in 1549 appoint two of the Corporation officers, known as the Secondaries of the Compters, who are bound under recognizances to ' peruse ' plays and report upon them to the Lord Mayor. But in the following year the London players themselves are bound only to perform plays licensed by the King himself or the Privy Council, and this too is the basis of Edward's proclamation of 1551 and Mary's of 1553.[2] The former requires a licence ' in writing vnder his maiesties signe, or signed by vj of his highnes priuie counsail ' ; the latter ' her graces speciall licence in writynge for the same '. By 1557, however, another change has taken place, and the duty of licensing is apparently delegated to the ecclesiastical authorities, that is to say the Commissioners for Religion.[3] These licences are of course for individual plays, and distinct from any general licences needed by a company in order to enable it to play at all.

When Elizabeth came to the throne she was perhaps more able than her predecessor to rely upon the municipalities in

[1] P. F. Tytler, *England under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary*, i. 21, from *S. P. D. Edw. VI*, i. 5.

[2] Gildersleeve, 5, points out that I was misled by Collier, i. 119, into citing the Marian proclamation in *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 220, under 1533 as well as 1553. I regret the error.

[3] Dasent, vi. 102. The Lord Mayor is to send offending players ' to the Commissioners for Religion to be by them further ordered, and also to take ordre that no playe be made hencefourthe within the Citie except the same be first seen and allowed and the players aucthorised '.

carrying out her ecclesiastical policy. It is true that the *Act of Uniformity*, like Edward's before her, forbade any words in the derogation, depraving or despising of the Book of Common Prayer, and committed the enforcement of this prohibition to the ecclesiastical ordinary as well as to the justices of assize and the civic mayors. It is true also that the general powers of jurisdiction in cases of sedition given to the High Commission by the patent of 19 July 1559 are wide enough to cover 'words or showings' as well as 'books'. But the elaborate provisions for a literary censorship under the Commission contained in the ecclesiastical *Injunctions* of the same year extend to printed matter only, and for the detailed supervision of plays the Government was at first content to look to the magistrates.[1] There seem to have been two proclamations. The first, which is not extant, is said to have been made on 7 April 1559 and to have restrained plays for a stated period. The second, of the following 16 May, was intended as a permanent regulation. After noting that the usual season for interludes was now over until 1 November, and the inconvenience of some recently given, it goes on to forbid any, whether in public or private, which have not been licensed by the Mayor in a town, or in a shire by the Lord Lieutenant or two justices for the immediate locality. The licensing authorities are enjoined to allow no handling of matters of religion or state in plays, and the nobility and gentry are warned to take order that 'their seruantes being players' shall respect the proclamation. It will be observed that only the licensing of plays and not the status of players was covered. Status was left as the Act of 1531, which was still in force and was explicitly confirmed in 1563, had left it. The position was then as follows. Players, at any rate when they performed away from home, must have a licence either from their lord or possibly from the local magistrates. Whether at home or abroad, they were subject to the regulation of the magistrates as to times and places, and the precautions needed to secure public health and order. In addition, the magistrates had a special responsibility under the proclamation for allowing their individual plays, but this, in rural areas where there were many Justice Shallows, might alternatively be exercised by the Lord Lieutenant for the county as a whole. It is, I suppose, a licence for their repertory rather than for their travelling that Lord Robert Dudley asked for his men

[1] Cf. ch. xxii and App. D, Nos. ix, xii, xiii. The Commission had also an authority over vagrants in or near London, which apparently disappeared after the legislation of 1572 (*vide infra*).

from the Earl of Shrewsbury, who as President of the North stood in the place of a Lord Lieutenant for Yorkshire, about a month after the issue of the proclamation. He calls it, indeed, a licence to play, but he dwells on the 'tollerable and convenient' character of their pieces, and it is easy to see how one conception of the purpose for which a licence was required would slip into another.

The history of play-licensing in London, which must now be followed in detail, really turns upon an attempt of the Corporation, goaded by the preachers, to convert their power of regulating plays into a power of suppressing plays, as the ultimate result of which even the power of regulation was lost to them, and the central government, acting through the Privy Council and the system of patents, with the Master of the Revels as a licenser, took the supervision of the stage into its own hands. The issue does not define itself very clearly until the 'seventies, perhaps partly because the Puritan sentiment took some time to grow, and partly because the earlier years are much less fully documented than the later ones.

As with all narratives pieced together out of fragmentary records, care must be taken not to lay too much stress on merely negative evidence with regard to any particular point. The two chief sources of information are the *Register* of the Privy Council, which contains minutes of letters written to the City Corporation or the Justices of Middlesex and Surrey and of other action taken by the Council with regard to plays, and the City *Remembrancia*, a book containing copies of letters passing between the Corporation and the Council or other persons of importance. But neither record is continuous during the whole controversy, and although the two frequently help each other out, some of the gaps unfortunately synchronize. In particular there is a comparative absence of information upon the first part of the reign, since the *Register* only begins to help in 1573 and the *Remembrancia* in 1580. It is possible, therefore, that the Court and the City may have come to grips on the vexed question of stage-control in London somewhat earlier than is now apparent.

It is certain, indeed, that some negotiations had taken place between the two authorities before the period to which the documents mainly relate. These are appealed to in a City letter of 1574, and it is claimed that, in view of the objections of the Corporation, the Council had 'long since' refrained from pressing a proposal that some private person should be nominated to license playing-places within the City.

This is the first mention of a new type of ' licence ', distinct from those of companies as such, or of plays as such, and presumably owing its origin to the general local regulative powers of the magistrates. The date of the proposal is not given, and as regards the years 1558–71, there is only occasional evidence of any serious interference, other than such as was necessitated by plague, with the activities of the players, although it is clear that the rulers of the City were exercising the powers of supervision with which the proclamation of 1559 invested them. There is an indication that plays were suspended by a precept from the Lord Mayor in the September of the first and greatest of the Elizabethan plague-years, 1563; and in the following February Edmund Grindal, the Bishop of London, wrote to Sir William Cecil, pointing out that the players set up their bills daily, and especially on holidays, and that the excessive resort of young people to their performances could only be a cause of infection. Both on religious and on hygienic grounds, he urged the desirability of inhibiting plays by proclamation, either permanently or at least for a complete year, and not only within the City, but for a circuit of three miles outside its boundaries. Penalties should, he thought, be imposed for disobedience, not only upon the players, but also upon the owners of the houses where they played. The cessation of the plague probably made it unnecessary for Cecil to entertain the suggestion seriously; but it is interesting to observe that the policy of the Puritans, with whom Grindal was in sympathy, was already in 1564 one of complete suppression, and also that the comparative inefficacy of measures limited to the City, in view of the populous suburbs outside the London jurisdiction and subject only to the Middlesex or Surrey Justices and to the Privy Council, had been already realized.

During the next few years there is little to record, although if *The Children of the Chapel Stript and Whipt*, alleged to have been printed in 1569, were ever recovered, it might throw more light upon the growing flood of Puritan sentiment than is afforded by Warton's scanty quotations. There was some plague in each of the three years 1568, 1569, and 1570, and in the summer of 1569 the City suspended plays, as a precautionary measure, from the last day of May to the last day of September. There was another suspension on 27 November 1571, for which plague is not alleged as a reason, but a few days later the Corporation appear to have changed their minds and licences were issued during this winter for performances by Leicester's and Abergavenny's men.

The year 1572 is marked by two measures of government, each of which had its reaction on the *status* of players throughout the country. The first entailed some regularization of the position of noblemen's companies. The fifteenth-century struggle between the power of the Crown and that of the great feudal houses had led to enactments forbidding subjects to attach to themselves, by the giving and taking of a livery or badge, retainers who were not in some bona-fide sense their own household servants or officers. The Acts against retainers had been continued up to the reign of Henry VII, who had confirmed them in 1487; and had then, upon the firm establishment of the royal supremacy by the Tudors, largely fallen into desuetude, in spite of a proclamation of 1545, already noticed, which was intended to call renewed attention to them. They were, however, still technically operative, and a proclamation of 3 January 1572 announced an intention to enforce them from the following 20 February. Their relation to the players is shown by the fact that the company which had been performing under the Earl of Leicester's name immediately wrote to their lord, and, while making it clear that they did not expect any wages beyond the livery to which they had been accustomed, begged for a definite appointment as his household servants and for a licence to certify the same as a security against interference under the revived statutes during their annual travels in the provinces. A second proclamation of the same character was issued on 19 April 1583. More important than the proclamation, but probably representing the same policy, was the repeal by Parliament of the Vagabond Act of 1531 and the substitution of a new statute, which came into force upon 24 August. This included in a definition of vagabonds, not only 'juglers, pedlars, tynkers and petye chapmen', but also 'fencers, bearewardes, comon players in enterludes, and minstrels, not belonging to any baron of this realme, or towardes any other honorable personage of greater degree'. Specific power was, however, given for the issue of local travelling licences by mayors and county justices. So far as noblemen's players were concerned, the Act was presumably no more than declaratory of their existing position. But the knight or plain gentleman lost his privilege of protection altogether; and in future, if his servants wished to travel as players, they had to get their licence from the magistrates. As a matter of fact, with the exception of those forming part of the royal household itself, practically all the companies of professional players which appeared in London during Elizabeth's reign were noblemen's servants. A few performances

were given at Court in early years by Sir Robert Lane's men, but these disappeared or transferred their services to a more honourable personage upon the legislation of 1572.[1] The most important of the provincial companies which did not come to London also bore the names of noblemen, and although many others were entertained by mere knights and gentlemen, it is probable that, at any rate after 1572, these did not range very widely from their head-quarters.[2] The necessity of procuring a fresh licence for every shire would doubtless, as was its intention, afford an obstacle to free circulation.[3] Apart from its defining clause, the main object of the Act of 1572 was to try once more the experiment, which had failed under Edward VI, of treating vagabondage with an increased severity. The summary whipping by individual magistrates was abolished except for children. An adult offender was to be committed to gaol until the next quarter sessions, and then, unless he could find a master to take him for a year's service, to be whipped and branded as a rogue by boring through the ear. On a second offence he was to be adjudged a felon, unless he could secure service for two years, and a third offence was to be treated as felony without benefit of clergy. The classification of unlicensed minstrels as rogues led to the insertion of a clause confirming the ancient privilege of the house of Dutton to issue licences within the county of Chester;[4] and another qualifying

[1] There is a doubtful notice of a Court play by the servants of George Evelyn of Wotton in 1588. Sir Percival Hart's sons played in 1565.

[2] The list of small travelling companies in Murray, ii. 77, 113, includes 14 belonging to knights and 3 to gentlemen in 1558–72, and 8 belonging to knights and 2 to gentlemen in 1573–97; also 7 companies under the names of their towns only in 1558–72 and 11 in 1573–97. Alexander Houghton of Lea in Lancashire wrote on 3 Aug. 1581 (G. J. Piccope, *Lancashire and Cheshire Wills*, ii. 238), 'Yt ys my wyll that Thomas Houghton of Brynescoules my brother shall have all my instrumentes belonginge to mewsyckes and all maner of playe clothes yf he be mynded to keppe and doe keppe players. And yf he wyll not keppe and maynteyne playeres then yt ys my wyll that Sir Thomas Heskethe Knyghte shall haue the same instrumentes and playe clothes. And I moste hertelye requyre the said Syr Thomas to be ffrendlye unto Foke Gyllome and William Shakshafte now dwellynge with me and ether to take theym unto his servyce or els to helpe theym to some good master'. Was then William Shakshafte a player in 1581?

[3] *S. P. D. Eliz.* clx. 48; clxiii. 44, record a dispute in 1583 between Sir Walter Waller and Mr. Potter, a J.P. of Kent. Waller, summoned before the Council, denies that his servants played an interlude at Brasted, and is confirmed by the constable and parishioners, who assert that Mr. Potter factiously sent the men to gaol as rogues. Lord Cobham made a vain attempt to reconcile the parties.

[4] Cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 259, on the history of this privilege. The reservation was continued by *39 Eliz.* c. 4, § 10 (1598). By *43 Eliz.* c. 9, § 2

provision, the importance of which in connexion with players has been overlooked, safeguarded the validity, as overriding the statute, of licences passed under the Great Seal of England. It is in 1572 also that symptoms of a conflict of judgement between the City and the Privy Council first declare themselves. The annalist Harrison records that in this year plays were 'banished' out of London for fear of infection, and on 20 May a minute of the Court of Aldermen records that letters had been received from the Council for renewed allowance under reasonable conditions, and that, in place of immediate compliance, a letter of protest, based on the peril of assemblies during a hot summer, was to be sent to Lord Burghley. A somewhat similar situation seems to have developed in 1573, which made it necessary in July for the Council to write two letters to the Corporation, of which the second had a peremptory note about it, in order to obtain permission for some Italian players to exhibit an 'instrument of strange motions', or puppet-show. The following year was evidently one of considerable friction. On 2 March the Corporation wrote to the Lord Chamberlain with reference to a suggestion that the licensing of playing-places within the City should be put in the hands of one Holmes. They maintained their earlier refusal, already mentioned, to commit such a matter to any private person, and added that they had other offers for the licensing rights on terms that would be profitable 'to the relefe of the poore in the hospitalles'. The terms of the letter make it clear that they regarded the plan as one which, besides being practically inconvenient, would entail a precedent 'farre extending to the hart of our liberties'. In the meantime plays were apparently inhibited, for on 22 March the Council wrote to inquire the causes of the restraint, 'to thintent their Lordships may the better aunswer suche as desyre to have libertye for the same'. It may be conjectured that the reply was unsatisfactory, for in May a remedy for which provision had been made by anticipation in the Vagabond Act of 1572 was resorted to, and a patent under the Great Seal was issued to the Earl of Leicester's men, which overruled the proclamation of 1559 and ignored the position of the Corporation altogether. By this the company received permission to play during the royal pleasure either within

(1601), it was made dependent on a certificate by the Lords Justices to the validity of Dutton's claim. Presumably this was obtained as the privilege was reserved unconditionally by *1 Jac. I*, c. 7, § 8 (1604). There were several Elizabethan actors of the name of Dutton (cf. ch. xv), but it is not known whether they belonged to the Cheshire house.

London itself or within or without any other town throughout the country. The licence was only subject to two provisions. One was that there should be no performance during common prayer or during plague times in London; the other that all plays should be seen and allowed by the Master of the Revels. As the Master of the Revels was an officer of the royal household, subordinate to the Lord Chamberlain, the action taken practically amounted to a transference of control, so far as this particular company was concerned, from the Corporation to the Court itself. Nothing specific was said in the patent about the allowing of playing-places as distinct from the allowing of plays, and it may have left the Corporation with some reasonable discretion on this point. It is not known that a similar licence was issued to any other Elizabethan company besides Leicester's men, although this could hardly be definitely asserted without a complete examination of the Patent Rolls for the reign. My own impression is that the issue of the patent served its purpose by bringing the Corporation to a more reasonable frame of mind, and that it was not found necessary to repeat the experiment, at any rate exactly in the same form. On 22 July the Council issued a passport to 'the comedie plaiers' to go to London, and also wrote to the Corporation requiring their admission and favourable usage. I feel little doubt that the company in question were the Italians who had been at Windsor and Reading during the progress. In any case it may be taken for granted from the events of the following winter that the Corporation were now beaten, and yielded. But it can only have been with reluctance. The enforced toleration of the Italian players, who seem to have brought with them some female acrobats, had added strength to the Puritan criticisms. Thomas Norton, the City Remembrancer, writing a preface to a summary of City customs for the use of the new Lord Mayor, James Hawes, and dwelling on the need for better regulations against the contagion of the plague, lays special stress on the danger of 'the unnecessarie and scarslie honeste resorts to plaies' and of such assemblies as those attracted by 'the unchaste, shamelesse and unnaturall tomblinge of the Italion weomen'. With a characteristic touch of Puritan logic he adds, 'To offend God and honestie, is not to cease a plague'. In fact, the increase of plague gave London a respite from plays during the winter. On 15 November the Privy Council wrote to the Justices of Middlesex, Essex, and Surrey to inhibit assemblies within ten miles of London until Easter; and the City hardly needed the stimulus of an 'admonition' from their lordships to

persuade them to adopt a similar course. They used the interval to enact an elaborate code for the regulation of plays, whose continuance in their midst, whether they liked it or not, they now saw to be inevitable. This took the form of an Act of Common Council, which is dated on 6 December 1574. The preamble sets out the various 'disorders and inconvenyences' which from the civic point of view had arisen from plays in the past, the unchaste and seditious speeches, the waste of money and interference with divine service, the accidents due to the fall of wooden structures and to the use of firearms upon the stage, the opportunities afforded by the performances for frays and quarrels, for purse-cutting, for the corruption of youth by 'previe and unmete contractes', for incontinency in the inner chambers of the 'greate innes' to which the stages were adjacent. It then proceeds to recite the recent inhibition for plague, and the need to provide against the renewal of such 'enormyties' upon the expected withdrawal of God's hand of sickness by securing that 'the laweful, honest and comelye use of plaies, pastymes and recreacions' should alone be permitted. The actual regulations are six in number. No unchaste, seditious, or otherwise improper plays were to be performed, upon a penalty of fourteen days' imprisonment and a fine of £5 for each offence. No play was to be shown which had not first been perused and allowed by such persons as the Lord Mayor and Aldermen might appoint. All playing-places and the persons in control of them were to be licensed by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen. All licensees were to be bound to the City Chamberlain for the keeping of good order. No licence was to be operative during a restraint for sickness or other good reason, nor were plays to be given or spectators received during the usual times for divine service on Sundays and holidays. Every licensee was to make such contributions to the poor and sick of the City as might be agreed upon with the Lord Mayor and Aldermen. Machinery was provided for the recovery of penalties, which were also to be for the benefit of the poor and sick, and an exception was made for plays in private houses for which no money was taken. The only regulation to which these were to be subject was that against the introduction of unchaste and seditious matters.

It is often stated that the regulations of 1574 were followed in 1575 by a decree of the Corporation banishing players totally and finally from the confines of the City. This is, however, a mistake due to an erroneous endorsement of date upon some documents which belong in reality to about 1584.

The regulations remained operative for a considerable number of years. It is true that, reasonable and moderate as they were, they were not accepted as satisfactory either by the players or by their critics. After all, they left a good deal in working to the discretion of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen for the time being; and the players seem to have come to the conclusion that it would be better to be independent, as far as possible, of the risks attaching to this discretion. They turned to the easier conditions afforded by the lax county government of the suburbs. Within two or three years after the issue of the regulations two houses had been built expressly for playing in the liberty of Halliwell, which was within the jurisdiction of Middlesex; the Theatre in 1576 and the Curtain either in the same year or early in 1577. A third house, at Newington Butts on the Surrey side, was already obsolete about 1592, and seems to have been in existence by 1580. Exactly upon what considerations the private house in the Blackfriars was established, also in 1576, is less certain. But at any rate, as a result of the action of the Corporation in 1574, the main locality of the popular drama was shifted from the courtyards of the London inns to the specialized suburban theatres. It must not, of course, be supposed that the inns fell altogether into disuse. The new arrangement was not without its inconveniences for the players. During the summer months it was no hardship for pleasure-seekers to cross the river or the fields in search of a spectacle. But the short evenings and dirty lanes of winter left an advantage to the inns in the heart of the City, which was not lightly to be forgone. It was still, therefore, a matter of importance for the companies to maintain their footing in the City, even if this meant compliance with harassing restrictions, and they were ready to use all their influence with the masters whose liveries they wore, with the Lord Chamberlain, and with the Privy Council, in opposition to any further limitation of their privileges. So far as the summer was concerned, the building of the suburban theatres was a serious check to the policy of the Corporation. It was still the young folk of the City who crowded the audiences; nor could the greater distance diminish the danger of infection, the neglect of divine service, the waste of time and money, or the likelihood of falling into bad company by the way. In future it was not sufficient to make salutary regulations for London; it was necessary to secure, by invoking the goodwill of the county justices, or in default of that even the aid of the Privy Council itself, that similar order should be taken outside

the liberties. In this direction the City never met with more than very partial success. The county government was naturally not as closely organized as their own, and it was in the hands of officials and local gentlemen to whom the business considerations and the growing Puritan instincts of the City tradesmen did not appeal. Richard Young, in particular, who was a prominent member of the Middlesex bench for many years, earned an evil reputation as a persecutor of Puritans.[1] On the other hand, the Corporation might look for the co-operation of his colleague William Fleetwood, who was their own Recorder,[2] and machinery had been established between the two areas in the form of a joint committee or court of assistants for dealing with the control of plays and other matters of 'good order'.[3]

And if the players needed a refuge from the regulations of 1574, these must have been far from satisfactory to the Puritans. They fell very far short of the wholesome Genevan model. There was still toleration for the infamous *histriones*. Plays were not even wholly forbidden on Sundays and holy days, and the crowd flocked to the inn-yard gates, already open in spite of the regulation, while the bells were still ringing for divine service in the empty churches. And although the Corporation certainly did not mean to commit the licensing of plays to the Master of the Revels or to any court nominee, there is nothing to show that they had any intention of leaving it to the ministers. The rise of the 'sumptuous' theatres, monuments of triumphant wickedness, in the fields, could only add fuel to the wrath of the moralists. With Thomas White's Paul's Cross sermon and John Northbrooke's *Treatise* of 1577 begins a period of active diatribe in pulpit and pamphlet, the deliberate intention of which was to stir the 'magistrate' to a stronger sense of the moral responsibilities of govern-

[1] For documents addressed to Richard Young or mentions of him, cf. App. D, Nos. lxviii, lxxiv, xc. He is often referred to in the *Hatfield MSS.*, in connexion with a monopoly of starch which he held, and otherwise. In 1593 (iv. 393) he writes 'from my house, Stratford the Bowe'. On 30 Nov. 1594 (v. 25) he wrote to the Queen, 'in these my aged and extreme or last days' with notes of many examinations, chiefly of papists, taken by him. On the other hand, Carter, *Shakespeare Puritan and Recusant*, 145, quotes an inscription on the coffin of Roger Rippon, who died in Newgate in 1592, 'his blood crieth for speedy vengeance against . . . M^r. Richard Young, a justice of the peace in London, who in this and many like points hath abused his power for the upholding of the Romish Antichrist, Prelacy and Priesthood'.

[2] Cf. p. 265. Collier, i. 254, quotes an epigram calling Fleetwood 'the enemy of all poor players'. John Field dedicates his *Godly Exhortation* (1583) to him as a Middlesex and Surrey Justice.

[3] Cf. App. D, Nos. xxxvii, lxviii.

ment, so that in London at least the letters of commendation furnished by godlessly-minded nobles for their servants might be disregarded and the accursed thing driven from the gates. And if only, through a Sidney or a Walsingham or a Leicester or a Burghley, the heart of the Council could be touched, it might perhaps even be driven from the suburbs also.

For some time after 1574 the relations between Whitehall and Guildhall were comparatively peaceful. Such plague as prevailed in 1575 and 1576 seems to have affected Westminster rather than the City. In 1577, however, an outbreak led the Corporation to suspend plays, and the Council ordered the Middlesex Justices to do the same from August to Michaelmas. The Theatre may have been open again by 5 October, although plague seems to have been still prevalent in November. It was over by January, and on the 13th of that month the Council instructed the Lord Mayor to let the famous Italian actor Drusiano Martinelli and his company perform in the City until the beginning of Lent. The autumn of 1578 again proved plaguesome, and on 10 November the Council ordered the Surrey Justices to inhibit plays in Southwark. On 23 December, however, a further order was issued to London, Middlesex, and Surrey, permitting the exercise of plays, subject to certain orders appointed against infection. This was followed on the next day by another letter to the Lord Mayor, specifying six companies who were summoned to Court and to whom therefore the privilege of exercising in public was to be limited. In the spring of the following year the Council appear to have been disturbed at the neglect of Lent, and on 13 March they wrote both to the Lord Mayor and to the Middlesex Justices, to direct that no plays should be allowed during the penitential season, either in that or in any subsequent year. By 1580 the battery of ' the preachers dayly cryeng against the Lord Maior and his bretheren ' seems to have had its effect upon the civic conscience. Naturally most of the sermons against the stage were never printed, but an example, in addition to that of Thomas White, is to be found in the Paul's Cross sermon of John Stockwood on 24 August 1578. Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse* had followed Northbrooke's *Treatise* in 1579, and in 1580 itself appeared the *Second and Third Blast of Retrait*, the conspicuous civic arms upon which are perhaps significant of the attitude now adopted by the Corporation. On 6 April there was an earthquake, which was seized upon by the controversialists as a sign of God's wrath against plays. The series of civic letters contained in the *Remembrancia* begins in this year, and shows a spirit of hostility

towards the stage far more pronounced than was indicated by the regulations of 1574. Under the stimulus of further pamphlets, Gosson's *Playes Confuted* in 1582 and Stubbes's *Anatomy of Abuses* in 1583, this tendency continued to grow, and finally landed the Corporation in a state of acute conflict with the Council. The earliest letter preserved is from the Lord Mayor to the Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas Bromley, on 12 April 1580. In this he took occasion, on the strength of a recent disturbance at the Theatre, of the admonition of the hand of God in the earthquake, and of a charge from the Council to avoid uncleanness and pestering of the city, to point out that players were ' a very superfluous sort of men and of such facultie as the lawes have disalowed ', and to suggest the desirability of an order by which they should be ' wholy stayed and forbidden ', both within and without the liberties. The disturbance at the Theatre was probably a fray between the Inns of Court and Oxford's men, which led to the imprisonment of some of the latter by the Council. Some months before John Brayne and James Burbage had been indicted for bringing about a breach of the peace by causing unlawful assemblies. There was not in fact much plague this summer, but the Council assented to a temporary inhibition until Michaelmas and called upon the Middlesex and Surrey Justices to extend it to Newington Butts and other places in their jurisdictions. Perhaps emboldened by his success, the Lord Mayor wrote a second letter on 17 June to Lord Burghley, in which he expressed the opinion that the haunting of unchaste plays in the suburbs was a serious danger to the City, and again proposed their restraint as part of a series of measures in the interests of the public health. Burghley's answer is not upon record. Presumably plays went on as usual during the winter of 1580. An incident of the following year makes it apparent that, at some uncertain but probably recent date, the Corporation had attempted to render the code of 1574 more stringent by forbidding performances upon Sundays. Lord Berkeley's men, who claimed to be ignorant of this, performed upon Sunday, 9 July 1581, and became involved in a fray with some Inns of Court men, which led to the committal of both parties to the Counter. On the very next day the Privy Council wrote to London and to Middlesex, and directed an inhibition of plays on the ground of plague until Michaelmas. The City responded by a suspension for an indefinite period on 13 July. They seem to have taken advantage of this to press their point about Sundays. On 14 November the Mayor issued a precept against the setting up of bills for plays within the

ward jurisdictions of the aldermen. On 18 November a letter was received from the Council pointing out that the infection had ceased, and that 'theis poore men the players' should now be permitted to exercise within the City for their 'releife' and 'redinesse with convenient matters for her highnes solace this next Christmas'. Nothing is here said about Sundays, but the Council Register contains a minute for a letter of 3 December to the Mayor, distinct, unless there is some confusion of date, from that of 18 November, of which there is no entry in the Register, and referring to a petition from the players, and a stipulation made with them that Sundays should be excluded, and performances limited to holy days and other week-days. This looks as if the Corporation had questioned the first mandate and had secured a concession as the price of submission. It must count as a victory for the Puritans, but they were not content, and one of the London ministers, John Field, took occasion to address a letter of reproach to the Earl of Leicester for yielding to the players, 'to the great greife of all the godly'.

It is difficult to resist the belief that a measure taken during this same December arose from a desire of the Council to counteract the growing recalcitrancy of the Corporation by a device similar to that which had been successful in 1574. The precedent set in the issue of a patent to Leicester's men was not, however, exactly followed. The position was now dealt with in a more comprehensive fashion, by the issue of a commission under a patent to the Master of the Revels himself. The object of this commission was in part to invest the Master with authority to press workmen and wares for the service of the Revels. But it also empowered him to call upon players and playmakers to appear before him and recite their pieces, presumably with a view to their consideration for performance at Court. And, as it were incidentally to the exercise of such a power, the patent went on to declare in the most general terms that the Master of the Revels was thereby appointed 'of all suche showes plaies plaiers and playmakers together with their playing places to order and reforme auctorise and put downe as shalbe thought meete or unmeete unto himselfe or his said deputie in that behalfe'. Like the licence of 1574, the commission of 1581 is expressed as being 'any acte statute ordynance or provision' to the contrary notwithstanding.

The functions thus assigned to the Master of the Revels came to be of the first importance in the history of the stage. But for the moment the result of their stroke can hardly have satisfied the expectations of the Council. The Corpora-

tion were not so ready to retreat from an untenable position as they had been seven years before. Either in ignorance of the Master's commission, or with the deliberate intention of asserting the privileges ignored therein, they seem to have definitely committed themselves, in the course of 1582, to the policy, long advocated by their spiritual advisers, of a complete suppression of the stage. The method of attack adopted was, so far as any records yet published disclose, a new one. Instead of relying upon their licensing powers, now very doubtful and in any case of no validity in the suburbs, they issued on 3 April a precept to the City guilds, enjoining them to charge all freemen with the responsibility of keeping their servants and other dependants from repairing to any play, whether in city or in suburbs, upon penalty of punishment both for the offending servant and for his master. This is presumably the 'late inhibition' against playing after evening prayer on holidays, which the Privy Council asked the Lord Mayor to revoke by a letter of 11 April, in which they expressed the opinion that in the absence of infection such playing might be used 'without impeachment of the service of God whereof we have a speciall care', provided always that Sundays should be excepted, and that fit persons should be appointed by the Corporation to 'consider and allowe of such playes onely as be fitt to yeld honest recreacion and no example of euell'. It is to be observed that the Council do not suggest that the allowance shall be done by the Master of the Revels or make any allusion to the powers conferred by his patent. Perhaps this indicates some willingness to come to a compromise. The Lord Mayor's reply, written two days later, is in its turn not otherwise than conciliatory. He suggests that the Council may perhaps not be fully aware of the difficulties entailed by plays on holidays. He has found that either he has to tolerate the admission of the audience during the times of prayer, or else the plays must continue until a very inconvenient time of night for servants and children to be abroad. He also calls attention to the growth of the plague, which seems to him to justify the continuance of the restraint for the present, and finally hints that later on he will fall in with the views of the Council and duly appoint suitable licensers. Plague was in fact rife during 1582, and perhaps left the Council no choice but to drop the question for a time. In July the Lord Mayor apologized on the ground of infection for refusing a request from the Earl of Warwick that a servant of his might be allowed to give a public display of fencing at the Bull in Bishopsgate. All that he could promise was to let the

man pass through the City with his company and drum on the way to the Theatre or some other place in the suburbs. Possibly the correspondence of April was only a cloak for the real intentions of the Corporation; or possibly they miscalculated the Council's reasons for not carrying it further. At any rate, still profiting by the continuance of the plague, they determined in the course of the autumn to risk another step in advance. The plan for working through the guilds was ill-conceived, and had probably failed; obviously masters could not effectively prevent their apprentices from slipping off to Finsbury or Southwark on holiday afternoons. At any rate nothing more is heard of it. To this date probably belongs an Act of Common Council, which after dealing with other matters of civic government, briefly enacted that public plays should 'wholly be prohibited as ungodly', and that suit should be made to the Council for a like prohibition 'in places near unto the city'.

It was not long before an opportunity for opening the projected campaign against the outside houses presented itself. On Sunday, 13 January 1583, eight persons were killed by the fall of a scaffold during a bear-baiting at Paris Garden in Surrey. John Field, Leicester's correspondent of 1581, was quick to point the Puritan moral in *A Godly Exhortation* dedicated to the Corporation. But already, on the day after the accident, the Lord Mayor, Sir Thomas Blank, had written to Lord Burghley to urge that this interposition of the hand of God called for redress of the abuse of the Sabbath day, and to beg for Burghley's good offices with the Surrey Justices, some of whom were willing to take action but alleged that they lacked commission. Burghley promised that the Council would consider the matter, and suggested that it was within the scope of the Corporation's authority to make a general order against the attendance of Londoners at Sunday entertainments. The previous year's experience, however, had probably impressed the Corporation with the difficulty of securing that such an order should not be a dead letter outside their own jurisdiction; and although the Council *Register* is deficient at this point, it is certain that the event at Paris Garden did in fact result in the extension by the Council itself of the prohibition against Sunday performances from the City to the counties. But this was not until after the Lord Mayor had again pressed the question in a letter to the Council of 3 July, in which he alleged the attractions of unlawful spectacles as a reason for the decay of archery, of which the Council had complained, and declared that Paris Garden was rebuilt and the Sunday bear-baitings in

full swing, and that blame was thrown upon the City authorities in Paul's Cross sermons and elsewhere, 'to our shame and greif, when we cannot remedie it'. If the Council yielded on this point, they remained quite firm on the general question of the toleration of plays, on all days other than Sundays, within the City as well as without. We do not know what steps, if any, they took to enforce the licensing powers of the Master of the Revels. But it is likely that the formation from the existing companies of the Queen's men in the March of 1583 was a deliberate and to some extent a successful attempt to overawe the City by the use of the royal name. It may be inferred from letters of the Lord Mayor to Richard Young of Middlesex and to Sir Francis Walsingham in April and May that plague prevented plays during the greater part of the year. But on 26 November the Council wrote that there was now no infection, and that Her Majesty's players were to be suffered to play as usual until the following Shrovetide. The Corporation, for all their Act of Common Council, made no open resistance, but they qualified the permission by limiting it to holy days, and it took a further letter from Sir Francis Walsingham on 1 December to get it extended to ordinary working days.

The struggle, however, was only deferred, and the real crisis came in 1584. During Whit-week there were frays amongst the knots of serving-men and prentices who hung about the doors of the Theatre and Curtain. The Corporation approached the Council and, although there seems to have been no plague, obtained sanction, in spite of the opposition of the Lord Chamberlain and Vice-Chamberlain, to the suppression of both houses. When the winter came round the Queen's men brought their case before the Council, and pointed out that the time of their service was at hand, that for the sake thereof as well as of their living they needed to exercise, and that the season of the year was past to play at any of the theatres outside the City. They petitioned for letters to the Lord Mayor to admit them to London, and also for an order to the Middlesex Justices, doubtless to revoke the suppression of the previous summer. Their case was set out more fully in a body of annexed articles. Unfortunately these are lost, but their tenor can be gathered from the City rejoinder. This took the form partly of an historical summary and partly of a detailed reply to the contentions of the players. The Corporation recited the reluctant toleration granted in 1574, the disregard of the rule against receiving spectators during divine service, the continued prevalence of abuses and the agitation of the preachers, the Act of

Common Council conjecturally assigned to 1582, and finally the ruin of Paris Garden and the abolition of Sunday plays to which it led. The analysis of the arguments of the Queen's men is in a mercilessly critical vein, very different to the reasonable regulations of 1574, and may perhaps be ascribed to the malicious wit of Recorder Fleetwood. The writer deals first with the alleged need for exercise before playing at Court, and suggests that exercise in private houses might suffice, as it was unsuitable, let alone the danger of bringing infection into the royal presence, to offer to Her Majesty pieces already produced before the basest assemblies of London and Middlesex. As to the stay of the players' living, the view, which must surely have gone back some decades for its justification, is put forward that in times past it had not been thought meet that players should look to playing for a living, 'but men for their lyvings using other honest and lawfull artes, or reteyned in honest services, have by companies learned some enterludes for some encreasce to their profit by other mens pleasures in vacant time of recreation'. The players had claimed in their first article that the Lord Mayor's order of toleration on holy days should continue; but the Act of Common Council had cancelled this, and moreover the provision against the reception of audiences before the end of common prayer had been disregarded. Nor was it comely for youth to run 'streight from prayer to playes, from Gods service to the Deuells'. The second article had dwelt on the difficulty in a dark and foul season of either going into the fields for plays, or deferring them until after evening prayer; but the true remedy was 'to leave of that unnecessarie expense of time, wherunto God himself geveth so many impediments'. The third article had proposed to make plays permissible, so long as the deaths from plague were below fifty a week. The reply is that 'to play in plagetime is to encrease the plage by infection: to play out of plagetime is to draw the plage by offendinges of God upon occasion of such playes'. But if the number of deaths from plague were to be taken as the basis of toleration, it must be remembered that this number was an inadequate measure of the danger of infection amongst the living, and to wait until it rose to fifty would be to run too great a risk for the sake of a few 'whoe if they were not her Maiesties servants shold by their profession be rogues'. The normal weekly number of deaths out of plague-time was between forty and fifty, and commonly under forty; surely it would be enough to allow plays when the rate from all causes had been for two or three weeks together under fifty. Toleration was only

claimed for the Queen's players. But this had been so in the previous winter, and all the playing-places had been filled with players calling themselves the Queen's men. Any letters or warrants for toleration should set out the number and names of the company. Much of this dialectic could hardly be taken seriously; it was accompanied by some suggested remedies of a practical character. The City still thought the limitation to private houses the better course. Failing that, the regulations of 1574 should be revived, subject to the conditions that playing should only be allowed when the total deaths had been under fifty a week for twenty days together, that no plays should be given on the Sabbath or before the close of evening prayer on holy days, that the audience should not be received during prayer-time, that the performances should be short enough to let the audience get home before dark, and that the Queen's men alone should be tolerated and should not be allowed to divide themselves into several companies. It was apparently contemplated that these conditions should apply to city and county alike.

I have described these arguments in some detail, because of the clearness with which they set out the divergent views. Unfortunately the documents from which they are drawn do not record any decision upon them. But whether the remedies were accepted, wholly or in part, or not, there can be no doubt whatever that the attempt to enforce an absolute prohibition had utterly failed, and that for several years afterwards the companies continued to find their winter quarters within London itself. Henceforward it became the settled policy of the Corporation to defer to the authority of the Privy Council, and to content themselves with doing their best to influence that body in the direction of their own ideals. There came a day when they were destined to reach some measure of success along these lines. For the time, however, events followed a quiet course. During two or three years there is a blank in the correspondence. Plays were suspended in London and Surrey during the summer of 1586, at the Lord Mayor's request, on the ground that the growing heat might breed a plague, and a similar measure in 1587 had an additional provocation in disturbances which had taken place at the play-houses. In both years the inhibition was declared early in May, and in 1587 it was fixed to terminate at the end of August. On 29 October the Council had to call the attention of both the Surrey and the Middlesex Justices to the imperfect observance of the order against Sunday plays. There was, of course, an undercurrent of Puritan discontent during these years at the lame issue of the

anti-stage agitation. This is well shown by a grumbling letter from a correspondent of Walsingham's in January 1587, in which 'the daily abuse of stage-plays' is represented as still 'an offence to the godly'. The redress of Sabbath-breaking is acknowledged, but still 'two hundred proud players jet in their silks' under the protection of various lords, as well as of Her Majesty. The writer proposes that every stage shall be required to pay a weekly subsidy in aid of the poor. The flood of pamphlets had, however, subsided. The *Mirror of Monsters*, published by William Rankins in 1587, is of markedly less importance than its predecessors. In November 1587 the City sent a deputation to the Privy Council in the hope of securing the suppression of plays within their boundaries; so far as is known, they were unsuccessful. A year or two later new combative relations were established between the players and the Puritans as an outcome of the Martin Marprelate controversy, which began with a series of anonymous pamphlets attacking the principles of episcopacy, and continued throughout 1589 and 1590. The players were not at first particularly concerned against their hereditary enemies. Tarlton, who died on 3 September 1588, is said himself to have satirized the existing ecclesiastical order in a mock discovery of Simony 'in Don John of Londons cellar'. And indeed the ribald style in which Martin Marprelate canvassed the bishops was held to be modelled on the manners of the theatre. 'The stage is brought into the church; and vices make play of church matters', said one episcopalian writer, and described Martin as declaring on his death-bed, 'All my foolery I bequeath to my good friend Lanam and his consort, from whom I had it'. Bacon also condemned 'this immodest and deformed manner of writing lately entertained, whereby matters of religion are handled in the style of the stage'.[1] But before long the vigour of the attack drove the bishops to seek on their side for an equally effective literary retort. They hired writers, including John Lyly and Thomas Nashe; and these not only answered Martin in his own vein, but also made use of the theatres for what must have been the congenial task of producing scurrilous plays against him. To this campaign there are many allusions in the pamphlets belonging to the controversy. The Puritans hit back with all their old contempt of the rogues and vagabonds dressed in the Queen's liveries; but the laugh was on the other side when Martin was brought dressed like a monstrous ape on the stage, and wormed and lanced to let the blood and evil

[1] Bacon, *On the Controversies of the Church* (Spedding, viii. 76).

humours out of him, or when Divinity appeared with a scratched face, complaining of the assaults received in the hideous creature's attacks upon her honour. *Vetus Comoedia*, the savage Aristophanic invective, was assuredly in full swing upon the English boards. Nashe professed to have another device ready, in which Martin was to figure in a grotesque pageant called the *May-Game of Martinism*; but the scandal was now getting too great, and the Government was obliged to disavow its own instruments. According to Nashe, it was by 'sly practice' that the comedies which had been penned were not allowed to be played. However this may have been, we find the Lord Mayor writing to Lord Burghley on 6 November 1589 that, in accordance with what he understood from a letter of his lordship to Mr. Young of Middlesex to be his desire, he had stayed plays in the City, in that the Master of the Revels 'did utterly mislike the same'. Almost immediately afterwards, on 12 November, the Privy Council issued three letters from 'the Starre Chamber' to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Mayor, and the Master of the Revels, directing the Master to join with a divine and with a person 'learned and of judgement' nominated by the other two, and form a commission for allowing the books of plays and striking out or reforming 'suche partes and matters as they shall fynde unfytt and undecent to be handled in playes, both for Divinitie and State'. Perpetual disabilities are threatened to players who produce any pieces not so allowed.

There are indications that in the next year or two a considerable increase took place in the number of plays given during each week. Other kinds of amusement, no less than more serious occupations, suffered, and in a letter of 25 July 1591 to London, Middlesex, and Surrey, the Privy Council had not merely to insist once more upon the due observance of Sunday, but also to forbid plays on Thursdays, on the ground that on this day bear-baiting and other like pastimes, maintained for the royal pleasure if occasion should require, had 'ben allwayes accustomed and practized'. In the following year the Corporation were moved to approach Archbishop Whitgift with a view to obtaining some redress of their grievances through his influence. By a letter of 25 February they set out the evils of plays in the familiar terms, expressing themselves as moved by the 'earnest continuall complaint' of the preachers and declaring that by no one thing was the government of the City 'so greatly annoyed and disquieted'. They explained the difficulty in which they were put by the authority conferred upon the Master of the Revels, who had

licensed the playing-houses, 'which before that time lay open to all the statutes for the punishing of these and such lyke disorders', and begged the Archbishop to confer with the Master as to the possibility of providing for the Queen's recreation without the necessity of public performances. A second letter of 6 March thanks the Archbishop for his advice, which apparently was, quite frankly, to bribe the Master. A committee of the Corporation was appointed on 18 March to treat with Tilney, but the scheme fell through for financial reasons. On 22 March the Court of the Merchant Taylors Company discussed a 'precepte' from the Lord Mayor, which called attention to the evils of plays and suggested 'the payment of one anuytie to one Mr. Tylney, mayster of the revelles of the Queenes house, in whose hands the redresse of this inconveniency doeth rest, and that those playes might be abandoned out of this citie'. The Court sympathized, but 'wayinge the damage of the president and enovacion of raysinge of anuyties upon the Companies of London', declined to unloose their purse-strings. On 12 June the Lord Mayor reported to Lord Burghley a disturbance in Southwark, the pretence for which had been furnished by a gathering at a play, held in defiance of orders on a Sunday. Anticipation of a renewal of disorder on Midsummer Day led the Council on 23 June to impose an inhibition on plays until the following Michaelmas. Three undated papers in the Henslowe-Alleyn collection at Dulwich may perhaps suggest that later in the summer they became willing to relax their severity. The first of these is a petition to the Council from Lord Strange's men, begging to be allowed to use their play-house on the Bankside, both for their own sake, as otherwise they would have to travel at considerable charge, and for that of the watermen who 'nowe in this long vacation' look for relief through ferrying spectators to and from the plays. The second is a petition from the watermen themselves to the same effect. The third is a copy of a warrant from the Council, setting out that not long since they had restrained Lord Strange's men from playing at the Rose and enjoined them to play at Newington Butts, and removing the injunction, 'by reason of the tediousness of the waie and that of longe tyme plaies have not there bene used on working daies'. If these documents really belong to 1592, which must remain doubtful, the permission to resume playing was almost certainly rendered nugatory by a plague more serious than any that had devastated London since 1563. In fact Henslowe's *Diary* shows no performances at the Rose between 22 June and 29 December, and the short winter

season that followed was abruptly broken off by a renewed outbreak and an order from the Privy Council on 28 January for the suppression of all assemblies for purposes of amusement within seven miles of London. This was probably renewed in April, and the companies, who had waited for some months in hopes of relaxation, had perforce to travel. On 29 April and 6 May the Council itself issued warrants of authorization to Lord Sussex's and Lord Strange's men respectively to assist them in taking this course. Probably the theatres remained closed during the greater part of the next eighteen months. Henslowe's *Diary* only indicates performances from 27 December 1593 to 6 February 1594, evidently interrupted by another restraint within five miles of London under a Council order of 3 February, and then a few more in April and in May. The Countess of Warwick's men seem to have been negotiating with the City for toleration on 10 May. Regular playing, however, was not resumed on Bankside until 3 June. The plague was now fairly over, and the shattered companies began to reconstruct themselves. In October Lord Hunsdon wrote to the Lord Mayor begging permission for his men to use the Cross Keys in Gracechurch Street. In November Francis Langley, one of the alnagers for London, was planning a new theatre, the Swan, on the Bankside, and the Lord Mayor once more detailed the objections to plays in a letter of protest to Lord Burghley. This was followed up on 13 September 1595 by a formal petition from the Corporation for 'the present stay and finall suppressing' of plays in Middlesex and Surrey. Herein the origin of yet another prentice riot was traced to the obnoxious performances. Obviously the request was not acceded to. Henslowe's *Diary* shows no break in the sequence of plays, except for Lent, until the July of 1596, when plague once more called for an inhibition. At about the same time the balance of parties on the Privy Council was seriously disturbed by the death of Henry Lord Hunsdon, who had been Lord Chamberlain since 1585. His successor, Lord Cobham, was less favourable to the players. In the course of the long vacation Thomas Nashe wrote of them as 'piteously persecuted by the Lord Maior and the Aldermen: and however in their old Lord's tyme they thought there state setled it is now so uncertayne they cannot build upon it'. In November there was a petition from inhabitants of the Blackfriars against the erection of a theatre in the precinct, which recited how 'all players being banished by the Lord Mayor from playing within the city by reason of the great inconveniences and ill rule that followeth them, they

now think to plant themselves in liberties'. At last the City had gained the point denied them in 1574 and again in 1584. Their importunity, in season and out of season, had moved the hearts of the autocratic body at Whitehall. Henceforward, although play-houses might stand thick enough within the rapidly growing suburbs beyond the gates, there were to be none, or at any rate none but 'private' houses, within the closely guarded circuit of the liberties. A fuller account of the transaction, without any clear indication of its date, is given many years later by Richard Rawlidge in *A Monster Lately Found Out, or The Scourging of Tipplers* (1628), and five play-houses are enumerated as pulled down and suppressed under authority from the Queen and Council by the 'religious senators'.[1]

The events of the next year must have given the Corporation high hopes of making an equally clean sweep in the suburbs. They had by now learnt that, although there were many abuses of the stage to which the Council would turn a blind eye, any interference in politics or encouragement, direct or indirect, to civil commotion, was not one of them. On 28 July 1597 they were able, in renewing their appeal for a 'present staie and fynall suppressinge' of the Middlesex and Surrey theatres, to add to their summary of 'inconveniences' a definite statement of a recent confession by some unruly apprentices that plays had served as the 'randevous' of their 'mutinus attemptes'. On the same day the Council wrote to the Middlesex and Surrey Justices, ordering not merely that there should be a restraint of plays within three miles of the City until Allhallowtide, but also that the owners of the theatres should be required 'to pluck downe quite the stages, gallories and roomes that are made for people to stand in, and so to deface the same as they maie not be ymploied agayne to suche use'. As their reason they cited the disorders, due partly to the 'confluence of bad people' at the play-houses, and partly to the handling of 'lewd matters' on the stage. There is reason to suppose that their action was not altogether determined by the representations of the City. A 'seditious' play called *The Isle of Dogs* had been shown on one of the Bankside stages.[2] This had been brought to their notice by the famous heretic-hunter and informer, Richard Topcliffe, and was, according to Henslowe's *Diary*, the cause of the restraint. The players and one of the makers of the play had been committed to prison; the other, Thomas Nashe, had fled to Yarmouth, leaving incriminating papers in his lodgings. On 15 August

[1] Cf. ch. xvi, introduction. [2] Cf. ch. xxiii, s.vv. Jonson, Nashe.

a commission was issued to Topcliffe and others to examine further into the matter and ascertain how far the 'lewd' play had been spread abroad. The second writer has recently been found to be Benjamin Jonson, who thus makes his stormy entry into a field of activity which he was destined, more than any other save one, to illustrate and adorn. It is natural to suppose that, in ordering the complete gutting of the theatres, the Council contemplated the continuance of the restraint even beyond Allhallowtide. But if so, they again changed their minds, and the City were disappointed. On 3 October a warrant was sent to the Keeper of the Marshalsea for the release of Jonson and of the offending players, and Henslowe's *Diary* notes the resumption of playing a week later. Evidently the Council had satisfied themselves, perhaps under the influence of another new Lord Chamberlain, George Lord Hunsdon, who had succeeded Lord Cobham in the course of the year, that it was after all impossible, in view of the amenities of the royal Christmas, wholly to dispense with plays.

This winter of 1597–8 is really an important turning-point in the history of stage-control. The events of the past two years, following upon a long period of vexatious conflict, seem to have brought the Government to the conclusion that the method of regulation through the magistrates had now broken down, and that the time had come for the resettlement of the matter upon the more centralized basis already foreshadowed by the commission to the Master of the Revels in 1581. Of this there are two indications. And first, for the county as a whole, a new Vagabond Act, replacing that of 1572, had been called for by the progressive development of the Elizabethan poor-law policy on the humane lines of a local rate, and the consequent possibility of discriminating more closely between the deserving poor and the idle vagrants. The latter class were again to be treated with greater severity. Summary whipping was reinstated and might be inflicted in future by local constables as well as justices. The more dangerous rogues were to be transported, and treated as felons if they returned. These were the main objects of the statute, but incidentally the status of players and minstrels was affected. The power of justices to license travelling was taken away. Before long even John Dutton had to prove his claim to his Cheshire privilege. The right of noblemen to protect their servants was not interfered with, and indeed must now have become even more important, as they acquired a monopoly; but it must be exercised under hand and seal and, although this point is not dealt with in the statute, must presumably be endorsed by the Master of the Revels.

As regards London and its suburbs in particular, the Privy Council, with the Master of the Revels as an adviser and agent, took the control into its own hands, and decided that the companies to be licensed should be limited to two. It seems likely that this policy took shape in a solemn order in Star Chamber, although the document itself has not reached us.[1] At any rate the rule is set out and confirmed in a letter written by the Lord Chamberlain and the Lord Admiral to the Justices and the Master of the Revels on 19 February 1598, in which complaint is made of the intrusion of a third company, not included in the Council's sanction and not bound to the Master of the Revels for observance of the conditions imposed. In principle it continued to prevail until the end of the reign, although in practice it was not found very easy to restrict the number of companies, and still less that of theatres. On the Surrey side, indeed, an element of local feeling adverse to the stage began to show itself, which perhaps owed its origin to little more than a dispute about the liability of the players to contribute to local assessments. It took shape in a petition from the vestry of St. Saviour's, Southwark, to the Council on 19 July 1598 for the closing of the play-houses in the parish, on account of the enormities that came thereby. But on 28 March 1600 the vestry were content that the churchwardens should 'talk with the players for tithes for their playhouses and for money for the poor, according to the order taken before my lords of Canterbury and London and the Master of the Revels'. In Middlesex, on the other hand, the growth of the western suburbs and their convenience for theatrical purposes led to divers new enterprises. The most important of these was the erection of the Fortune in St. Giles's, Cripplegate, by Edward Alleyn during 1600. The Council seem to have been in two minds about the desirability of the scheme. In January the project had been encouraged by a personal letter from the Lord Admiral to the Middlesex Justices. Some of the inhabitants, however, raised a protest, and in March the Council ordered the Justices in nowise to permit the building, as that would be inconsistent with the order for the plucking down of theatres given them 'not longe sithence'. If this means the order of 28 July 1597, the Council seem to have forgotten that their own action later in the same year had rendered it nugatory; nor were they very consistent when, on 15 May 1600, they allowed the use of the Swan, which certainly should have been plucked down in 1597, for feats of activity by Peter Bromvill, an acrobat specially recom-

[1] Cf. App. D, No. cxx.

mended to Elizabeth by the French king. Ultimately the question of the Fortune received a final reconsideration. The inhabitants, just as in Southwark, were squared by the promise of liberal contributions towards poor relief. Possibly, also, the Queen herself intervened in Alleyn's favour, and on 8 April the consent of the Council was signified by a further letter to the justices. On 22 June the allowance was explained and the principle adopted in 1597 reaffirmed by an Order in Council, which was not, however, passed without some 'question and debate'. There were to be two houses and no more, the Fortune in Middlesex for the Admiral's men and the Globe in Surrey for the Chamberlain's. In addition to the old prohibitions of plays on Sunday, in Lent or during infection, two new restrictions make their appearance. No plays were in future to be given in any 'common inn', and neither of the privileged companies was to play more than twice a week. A few months before, on 1 April 1600, the Middlesex Justices had stopped a contemplated playhouse in East Smithfield on the strength of the Star Chamber order. But the twice-repeated limitation of the Privy Council, for all the formality of its expression, seems to have had the shortest of lives. By October 1600 it had already been broken by Pembroke's men, who began to play in that month as a third company at the Rose. During the same year the Chapel boys and those of St. Paul's were also performing, although no doubt these were technically located in 'private' houses. Blackfriars, where the Chapel plays were given, was not yet in the full sense part of the City; it was, however, to the Lord Mayor that the Council gave instructions on 11 March 1601 to stop plays in the Blackfriars, as well as at St. Paul's, during Lent. In May the Curtain was open, and although the Council suppressed a particular play there, they did not suppress the house. By the end of 1601 the order of the previous year had fallen into complete disregard. There were a 'multitude of playhowses' and a daily concourse of people to the plays. The Corporation complained and were informed by the Council on 31 December that the fault lay largely with themselves and their predecessors, as they had failed to see to the execution of their lordships' directions. These were renewed, and a reminder was also sent to the county Justices. It has been suggested that the attitudes of the Corporation and the Council had now been reversed, and that the former had become favourably disposed towards the players.[1] I find

[1] Wallace, ii. 162.

no evidence of this. Probably the City policy was to show that the Council's attempt at regulation had broken down, and that complete prohibition had become the only remedy. On 31 March 1602 the Council wrote again to the Lord Mayor, who had reported some amendment of the abuses, and announced that, 'upon noteice of her Maiesties pleasure at the suit of the Earle of Oxford', a third company, made up of the Earl's servants and of those of the Earl of Worcester, were to be tolerated, and were to have the Boar's Head as their sole playing-place.

Plays were suspended by the Council on 19 March 1603 during the illness of the Queen, which terminated fatally on 24 March. Their resumption was anticipated on the coming of James, one of whose first acts was to issue on 7 May a proclamation against plays or bear-baiting on Sundays. But plague intervened, a plague more deadly even than that of 1592–4; and it was not until after the Lent of 1604 that on 9 April the Council authorized the three companies of players to the King, Queen, and Prince to perform at the Globe, Curtain, and Fortune, so long as the weekly plague-deaths should not exceed thirty. These were the former companies of the Chamberlain's, Worcester's, and the Admiral's men, now taken directly into the royal service. By a piece of generosity not paralleled during the late reign, the King's men had received a payment of £30 from the Treasurer of the Chamber in February for their 'maintenance and relief', in view of the prohibition of performances during the plague. The attachment of the three companies to the royal households is to be regarded as something a little more than a mere honour bestowed upon them. It signified a further advance on the lines already laid down in 1597 and 1600 of direct royal control in affairs theatrical. In favour of the King's men, the precedent set for Leicester's men in 1574 was revived, and their privileges, formerly dependent upon orders of the Privy Council, were conferred upon them by a licence under letters patent. A similar patent was drafted for Queen Anne's men, but was not at the time executed. In 1606 a provincial detachment of these men was using a letter of recommendation from the Queen herself as a warrant; they did not receive a licence under letters patent until 1609. Gradually, however, the issue of a patent became the normal Jacobean method of licensing the privileged London players. The Children of the Queen's Revels received theirs in 1604 and a new one in 1610, the Prince's men in 1606, the Duke of York's in 1610, the Lady Elizabeth's in 1611, and the Elector Palatine's in 1613. In 1615 a patent of an exceptional type

was issued to Philip Rosseter and his partners for a new theatre at Porter's Hall in the Blackfriars. In the patents for companies the model of the 1574 patent is in the main followed, but as a rule the 'usual howse' in which the company will play is named. This, however, does not seem to be meant to fetter their discretion to use some other convenient house, and a general authority to play in the provinces is, except in the case of the Revels Children, always added. There is no such limitation on playing to two days a week as was imposed on the companies by the Council order of 1600. Most of the patents contain a clause reserving 'all auctoritie power priuiledges and profittes' appertaining to the Master of the Revels under his patent or commission. This is omitted in the licence for the King's men and in both of those for the Revels Children, whose 1604 patent contains a special clause requiring their plays to have the 'approbacion and allowaunce' of Samuel Daniel, whom Queen Anne had appointed for that purpose.[1] It became the duty of the Master to scrutinize the phraseology of plays in the light of an *Act to Restrain Abuses of Players*, passed in May 1606, which imposed a penalty of £10 for any profane or jesting use of the names of God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Ghost, or the Trinity, in any stage-play, interlude, show, May-game, or pageant. This statute, even if not always literally observed, entailed much revision of existing dramatic texts.

If the system of patents did not render the London players independent of the Master of the Revels, still less did it abrogate from the ultimate authority of the King in Council. There is evidence that the theatres were closed in the autumn of 1605, during which plague was prevalent, and in this matter the responsibility for action still rested with the Council.[2] Unfortunately the full Register for the period 1603–13 is missing. A letter of 12 April 1607 from the City asking for a restraint is addressed to the Lord Chamberlain, whose function it would no doubt be to move the Council. In this or some later year the Whitefriars vestry seem also to have made a protest against the dumping of a play-house in their precinct.[3] That plague interfered with plays in 1608–9,

[1] There is no reference to licensing in the later Queen's Revels patent of 1610. That for the Queen's men in 1609 has the usual provision for licensing by the Master of the Revels. This was, however, not inconsistent with 'a kind of gouernment and suruey ouer the said players' by the Chamberlain of the Queen's Household (cf. ch. xiii).

[2] Philip Gawdy (*Letters*, 160) writes on 28 Oct. 1605 of his nephew in London, 'Playes he was never at any, for they are all put downe'; cf. App. D, Nos. cxxxix, cxl.

[3] Cf. ch. xvii.

and 1609–10 also, is indicated by payments made to the King's men 'for their private practice' during these years. After 1610 London was no more troubled by the plague until 1625. Other reasons for inhibiting plays sometimes presented themselves. Some bad political indiscretions of 1608, which will require consideration in the next chapter, led to a temporary suspension of performances and a royal threat of permanent suppression. The untimely death of Prince Henry on 7 November 1612 threw a shadow upon all mirth, and the Council declared that 'these tymes doe not suite with such playes and idle shewes, as are daily to be seene in and neere the cittie of London, to the scandall of order and good governement at all occasions when they are most tollerable'. On 29 March 1615 the Council summoned representatives of all the London companies before them, to answer for playing in Lent, contrary to the express direction of the Lord Chamberlain given through the Master of the Revels. The records of suburban administration show the Middlesex Justices trying William Claiton, an East Smithfield victualler, on 20 December 1608, for suffering plays to be performed in his house during the night season, and on 1 October 1612 making an Order for Suppressing Jigs at the End of Plays, on the ground that the lewd jigs, songs, and dances so used at the Fortune led to the resort of cutpurses and other ill-disposed persons and to consequent breaches of the peace. Generally speaking, the problem of metropolitan stage-control may be said, during the reign of James I, to have reached a condition of comparative stability.

As regards the provinces there has been some misapprehension. The royal patents of course ran there, and there is one example of a patent issued to a company which actually had its head-quarters in a provincial town, that to the Children of the Queen's Chamber of Bristol, granted through the influence of Queen Anne, who had visited Bristol on her progress in 1613. But in the provinces the patented companies had no monopoly; side by side with them still wandered both unlicensed vagrants and the protected servants of noblemen. It is true that a Vagabond Act of 1604, which in the main and with certain exceptions, such as dropping the experiment of transportation, continued the policy of that of 1597, has been supposed to have withdrawn the privilege of protection.[1] But the provincial records show that in fact the noble-

[1] Some interesting light is thrown on the workings of the Vagabond Acts in the North Riding of Yorkshire by the presentations in *Quarter Sessions Records* (*North Riding Record Soc.*), i. 204, 260; ii. 110, 119, 197. At Topcliffe on 2 Oct. 1610 Thomas Pant, apprentice to Christopher

men's companies were still afoot, and the provision of the statute itself, when carefully read, bears quite another interpretation.[1] It professes to be declaratory of that of Elizabeth on which 'divers doubtes and questions' had arisen, and after reciting the catalogue of persons who were to be classed as vagrants, which includes not only players of interludes, but also fencers, bearwards, minstrels, begging scholars and sailors, palmists, fortune-tellers, proctors, and others, it lays down that no authority shall be given by noblemen to 'any other person or persons'; that is surely, to any of the persons named in the catalogue, other than the players of interludes belonging to the noblemen and authorized under their hands and seals, for whom exception is specifically made therein.[2] The system of patents lent itself to certain abuses by travelling companies. Exemplifications were taken out in duplicate, and while the regular company remained in London, a quite distinct one would go on tour with one of the duplicates and, if necessary, an instrument of deputation from the man named in the patent of which it was a copy.[3] This practice was condemned in 1616 by a warrant of the Lord Chamberlain, to whose department the supervision of the issue of playing patents, as well as the general supervision of the Master of the Revels, appears to have been entrusted. The same document also condemns a company which had

Simpson of Egton, shoemaker and recusant, was released from his indentures on complaining that he had been 'trayned up for these three yeres in wandering in the country and playing of interludes'. At Helmesley on 8 July 1612 Christopher Simpson, late of Egton, was presented and fined as a player, and Richard Dawson, tanner and constable of Stokesley, for allowing Christopher and also Robert Simpson of Staythes, shoemaker, Richard Hudson of Hutton Bushell, weaver, and Edward Lister of Allerston, weaver, to wander as common players of interludes. A similar charge was made against William Blackborne, labourer and constable of Marton, as regards Robert Simpson, Richard Knagges of Moorsham, William Fetherston of Danby, and James Pickering of Bowlby, mason. At Helmesley on 9 Jan. 1616 a number of gentlemen and yeomen were presented for receiving players in their houses and giving them bread and drink. John, Richard, and Cuthbert Simpson, recusants, of Egton, Robert Simpson, of Staythes, and four other players were fined 10*s.* each. There were similar cases at Hutton Bushell on 4 April 1616, at Thirsk on 10 April 1616 and 7 April 1619, and at Helmesley on 9 July 1616. Presumably the Simpsons were the same men who brought Sir John Yorke into trouble with the Star Chamber in 1614 (cf. p. 328).

[1] Gildersleeve, 28, 35, 38. The origin of the error is probably in the shoulder-note 'No Licence by any Noblemen shall exempt Players' to *1 Jac. I*, c. 7, § 1, in the R. O. edition of the *Statutes*.

[2] The players of Lords Berkeley, Chandos, Dudley, Evers, Huntingdon, and Mounteagle (Murray, ii. 28, 32, 43, 45, 49, 57), as well as those of the Duke of Lennox (cf. ch. xiii), are still traceable after 1604.

[3] Cf. App. D, No. clviii, and ch. xiii, s.v. Anne's.

been travelling under a 'warrant', by which is apparently meant a licence under the royal sign manual or signet, used instead of an elaborate and doubtless expensive patent.[1] The signet licences were, however, such an obvious convenience that it was not long before they came to be regularly issued to players under the administration of the Lord Chamberlain himself.[2] This is a topic which lies rather beyond my purview. Nor can I dwell at any length on the evidence which shows that the licences given to players, like other assumptions of the royal prerogative, did not pass altogether without criticism from contemporary constitutionalists. I do not know whether it was a weak point that the statutory sanction taken for the patents in 1572 was not re-enacted in 1597. Their wording purported clearly enough to give the holders an authority to play both within and without the liberties and freedoms of any cities, towns, and boroughs. But Chief Justice Sir Edward Coke, charging a Norwich jury on 4 August 1606, appears to have told the justices that the remedy of the abuses due to players was entirely in their hands—'they hauing no commission to play in any place without leaue: and therefore, if by your willingnesse they be not entertained, you may soone be rid of them'.[3] Too much stress must not be laid upon this, for Coke vigorously repudiated the accuracy of the printed edition of his charge from which the passage is taken.[4] But Prynne seems to insinuate a very similar argument in his *Histriomastix* of 1633,[5] and in any event the validity of the patents was terminated by the final ordinance for the suppression of plays passed by the Long Parliament on 9 February 1648, which enacted that 'all stage-players, and players of interludes, and common playes, are hereby declared to be, and are, and shall

[1] Cf. ch. xii, s.v. King's Revels. A later warrant of 20 Nov. 1622 deals with the same abuse of players and others who 'without the knowledge and approbacon of his maiesties office of the Revels' travel 'by reason of certaine grants comissions and lycences which they haue by secret meanes procured both from the Kings Maiestie and also from diuerse noblemen' (Murray, ii. 351).

[2] *M. S. C.* i. 284; Murray, ii. 192.

[3] *The Lord Coke his Speech and Charge. With a Discouerie of the Abuses and Corruption of Officers* (1607) H_2. There is an epistle to the Earl of Exeter signed R. P., said (*D. N. B.*) to be Robert Pricket.

[4] Coke, *Preface to 7th Report*, 'libellum quendam . . . rudem et inconcinnum . . . quem sane contestor non solum me omnino insciente fuisse divulgatum, sed . . . ne unam quidem sententiolam eo sensu et significatione, prout dicta erat, fuisse enarratam'; cf. Gildersleeve, 40; J. Haslewood in *Gentleman's Magazine*, lxxxvi. 1. 205; *1 N. Q.* vii. 376, 433.

[5] Prynne, 492, 497.

be taken to be, rogues, . . . whether they be wanderers or no, and notwithstanding any license whatsoever from the King or any person or persons to that purpose '.[1] We, however, are now concerned, not with the decadence of the stage, but with its palmy days under Elizabeth and James.

[1] Hazlitt, *E. D. S.* 67.

X

THE ACTOR'S QUALITY

[*Bibliographical Note.*—This chapter mainly rests upon the official documents in Appendix D, the plague-data in Appendix E, and the detailed accounts of individual companies in Book III. To the books and dissertations cited for those sections and for chapter viii may be added, as studies of the stage in its political aspect, R. Simpson, *The Political Use of the Stage in Shakespeare's Time* and *The Politics of Shakespere's Historical Plays* (1874, *N. S. S. Trans.* 371, 396), S. R. Gardiner, *The Political Element in Massinger* (1875–6, *N. S. S. Trans.* 314), S. Lee, *The Topical Side of the Elizabethan Drama* and *Elizabethan England and the Jews* (1887–92, *N. S. S.* 1, 143), J. A. de Rothschild, *Shakespeare and his Day* (1906), T. S. Graves, *Some Allusions to Religious and Political Plays* (1912, *M. P.* ix. 545), and *The Political Use of the Stage during the Reign of James I* (1914, *Anglia*, xxxviii. 137). The fragments of Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, showing the working of the censorship from 1623 to 1642, usually cited from the *Shakespeare Variorum* (1821), and G. Chalmers, *Supplemental Apology* (1799), are now conveniently collected in J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert* (1917). A useful study has recently appeared in A. Thaler, *The Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England* (1920, *M. P.* xvii. 489).]

The history detailed in the foregoing chapter represents, from the point of view of the playing companies, a vexed progress towards that state of regulative security which, in the case of any industry dependent upon a permanent habitation and the outlay of capital, is the first condition of economic stability. More than once in the course of the struggle was an approach made to a settlement before it was actually reached. The rather obscure period of the first attempts of the companies to establish themselves in London was closed by the experimental patent to Leicester's men and the fairly reasonable City regulations of 1574. But the building of the suburban theatres on the one hand and the aggressiveness of the preachers on the other broke down the equilibrium; and there followed a period of acute conflict, of which the commission to the Master of the Revels in 1581, the City prohibition of 1582, the appointment of the Queen's men in 1583, and the controversy before the Privy Council in 1584 formed the final stages. The players were victorious, and the result of their victory was an assured position under the Council and the Master of the Revels, which was not indeed wholly accepted by the City, and was seriously threatened in 1596 and 1597, but only to be the more firmly established in the

latter year when the central government assumed direct responsibility for the regulation of the stage throughout the London area. I think that 1597 must be regarded as the critical moment at which complete stability was attained; the substitution under James I of letters patent for Star Chamber orders as the licensing machinery was of comparatively slight importance. From 1597 onwards it was definitely the Crown and not the local authorities which determined the companies to whom, subject to the detailed administrative control of the Privy Council, the Lord Chamberlain, and his subordinate the Master of the Revels, the privilege of playing within the neighbourhood of London should be conceded. And the policy of the Crown, alike under Elizabeth and under the Stuarts, was consistently in favour of such solace and recreation for the Sovereign and the subjects as the players ministered.

And so, tentatively up to 1584, and thereafter with a security which received final confirmation in 1597, the actor's occupation began to take its place as a regular profession, in which money might with reasonable safety be invested, to which a man might look for the career of a lifetime, and in which he might venture to bring up his children. As early as 1574 the patent to Leicester's men refers to playing as an 'arte and facultye'. In 1581 the Privy Council call it a 'trade'; in 1582 a 'profession'; in 1593 a 'qualitie'. The order of 1600 explicitly recognizes that it 'may with a good order and moderacion be suffered in a well gouerned estate'. So that when Fleetwood takes occasion in 1584 to recall that originally interludes were merely the by-work of 'men for their lyvings using other honest and lawfull artes, or reteyned in honest services', his argument has already become anachronistic, not wholly justified even as an antiquarian quibble, and still less as a serious appreciation of the administrative facts with which the writer had to deal. The player of the seventeenth century is in fact as necessary a member of the polity as the minstrel of the twelfth or the fourteenth; with this distinction that, in London at least, he is a householder and not a vagrant, and is therefore able to perform his function on a larger scale and with a fuller use of the methods and advantages of co-operation.

Obviously the player's status, like any other status in a civilized community, depended upon the observance on his side of certain obligations. He had to get his formal authority or licence for the exercise of his art. He had to respect certain prescribed limitations of times and seasons. He had to shoulder certain responsibilities imposed upon him as a

subject and a citizen. To each of these aspects of his calling some measure of detailed consideration is due.

A company of players was not in form, like a company of merchants, a guild or association of independent men. Its constitution had a mediaeval element, by which the derivation of playing from minstrelsy is strongly recalled. The nature of the licence which it must hold, at any rate if it desired to secure itself from the arbitrary discretion of local justices, was determined by statute. And this licence, whether it took the form of a warrant from a nobleman with the confirmation of the Master of the Revels, or of a royal licence by patent, was always such as to set up a relation of service between the company and a 'lord'. Nor is this relation to be dismissed as a mere empty formality. Probably the players of many country nobles and gentlemen continued to the end to consist of their ordinary household servants, who played only at Christmas and other times of recreation, and mainly at their lord's expense.[1] With the regular travelling companies, and particularly with the London companies, it was different. Financially, at least, they were independent. But even of these the 'service', though largely a legal fiction, was not wholly so. The Statutes of Retainers, kept alive by the proclamations of 1572 and 1583, forbade the maintenance of retainers who were not in some real sense household servants. The consequent application made by his players to the Earl of Leicester in 1572 does not suggest that the distinction was a very vital one. Certainly they guard themselves against being supposed to be asking their lord for a fee. But I think it is clear that the lord was expected to take some responsibility for the conduct of those who used his name, and to exercise some discipline in cases of misdemeanour. It was so in 1559, when the proclamation against unlicensed plays expressly called upon noblemen and gentlemen having players to see that it received attention from their servants. And it must still have been so in 1583, when the ill behaviour of Worcester's men at Norwich was effectively checked by a threat to certify their lord of their contempt. On the other hand there is abundant evidence that the lord might be looked to, in time of need, to intervene for the active furtherance of the interests of his players, over and above the general recommendation to favour for his sake, which is common form in the warrants of

[1] Murray, ii. 77, gives records of seventy-nine 'Lesser Men's Companies', many of which appear at one town only, while all have a narrow range. Naturally the names of the great nobles carried weight over a wider area. The players in *Ratseis Ghost* (Halliwell-Phillipps, i. 326) 'denied their owne Lord and Maister, and used another Noblemans name'.

protection and even in the royal patents. Thus Leicester is found writing to the President of the North on behalf of his men in 1559, Berkeley and Hunsdon to the City in 1581 and 1594 respectively, Nottingham to Middlesex in 1600, Lennox for his men in 1604; while the toleration of Oxford's and Worcester's men as a third London company in 1602 is expressly stated by the Privy Council to be due to the suit of the Earl of Oxford to the Queen. On their side the players no doubt had reciprocal courtesies, if no more, to pay. They wore the lord's livery and bore his badge.[1] Leicester's men refer to their livery in their letter of 1572, and in 1588 they had occasion to make their complaint to the Norwich Corporation of a local cobbler 'for lewd woords uttered ageynst the ragged staff'. A practice of offering up a prayer for the lord's well-being at the end of a performance was probably of ancient derivation, although whether it survived in the public theatres may perhaps be doubted.[2] There are instances, moreover, which suggest that, if the lord had need of players for the celebration of a wedding or other festivity, it was to his own servants that he would naturally turn. Thus Leicester had his company with him on his expedition to the Netherlands in 1585, and it was the Chamberlain's men who were called upon to play *Henry IV* at Hunsdon's house in the Blackfriars when he entertained the Flemish ambassador Verreyken in 1600. Similarly the royal companies, under both Elizabeth and James, formed integral parts of the royal household. They were attached to the Lord Chamberlain's department, and ranked as Grooms of the Chamber. And on one occasion at least, the visit of the Constable of Castile in 1604, the King's and Queen's men were actually assigned, in their capacity as Grooms, to the service of the distinguished strangers. Their exact status is, however, a matter of some difficulty. The old interlude players had held an independent position as such, with fees charged originally on the Exchequer and afterwards on the Chamber, at higher rates than those of

[1] The showman of the royal ape in Taylor's *Wit and Mirth* (cf. p. 267) wears 'a brooch in his hat, like a tooth drawer, with a Rose and Crowne, and two letters'.

[2] Harington, *Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596), 135, 'I will neither end with sermon nor with prayer, lest some wags liken me to my L. ( ) players, who when they have ended a bawdy comedy, as though that were a preparative to devotion, kneel down solemnly, and pray all the company to pray with them for their good Lord and master'; *A Mad World, my Masters*, v. ii. 200, 'This shows like kneeling after the play; I praying for my good lord Owemuch and his good countess, our honourable lady and mistress'. This prayer might be combined with one for the Sovereign and estates; cf. chh. xviii, xxii.

Grooms of the Chamber, and the liveries not of Grooms but of Yeomen. When they died out, they were replaced by the Queen's men of 1583. Howes tells us that these 'were sworn the queen's servants and were allowed wages and liveries as grooms of the chamber'. Howes is not quite a contemporary authority, and makes at least a technical mistake when he adds that until 1583 'the queene had no players'. If by 'wages' he means such annual fees as the interlude players had received, his statement is not confirmed by the Chamber Accounts, and it is not very likely that such payments were put back upon the Exchequer. It is true that fee-lists, not only Elizabethan but Jacobean, continue to include eight players of interludes at £3 6*s.* 8*d.* each, but I doubt whether this can be safely taken as evidence that the vacancies were filled.[1] No doubt, however, Howes was accurate on the main point, for Tarlton is described in a document of 1587 as an 'ordenary grome off her majestes chamber', and both Tarlton and Johnson as 'groomes of her majesties chamber' in another of 1588. I may add that in a list of the sixteen ordinary grooms who received allowances at Elizabeth's funeral are to be found the names of George Brian and John Singer.[2] These had been respectively a Chamberlain's and an Admiral's man, but both seem to have left playing before the date of the list, and I suspect that they retired on taking up these active Household appointments. For the King's players there is fuller testimony, although most of it is Caroline rather than Jacobean. The players are not called Grooms of the Chamber in their patents of appointment; but this proves nothing, as most of the Household posts were conferred, not by patent, but by swearing-in before the Lord Chamberlain or other high officer. But they received payment as 'his Maiesties Groomes of the Chamber and Players', when they waited upon the Spanish ambassador in 1604, and are entered in the Chamber Accounts for this payment as a distinct group, apart from the seven ordinary and four extraordinary grooms who were also assigned to the ambassador's service. The Queen's men, who waited upon the Flemish commissioners, are similarly described as being 'Groomes of the Chamber and the Queenes Players'. A few months before the King's, Queen's, and Prince's players had all received 4½ yards of red cloth each as a livery at the time of James's coronation procession.[3] Nearly a quarter of a century later we find very

[1] Cf. ch. xiii (Interluders).

[2] *R. O. Lord Chamberlain's Records*, ii. 4 (4).

[3] *N. S. S. Trans.* (*1877–9*), 15*, from *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, vol. 58*a*, now ii. 4 (5).

similar liveries furnished for both the King's and the Queen's men by a series of Lord Chamberlain's warrants to his Wardrobe, which begin in 1622.[1] These liveries were renewed every two years and consisted at first of three, and afterwards of four, yards of bastard scarlet for a cloak, and a quarter of a yard of crimson velvet for a cap. These were of course state liveries, not the 'watching' liveries of medley-coloured cloth, at 5*s.* a yard as against the 26*s.* 8*d.* paid for the scarlet.[2] The Chamberlain's books of the same period also contain warrants for the swearing-in of new members of the King's and other companies, and in these the players are directed to be sworn as 'grooms of the chamber in ordinary without fee'.[3] These are, as I say, Caroline records, but if we may assume that the procedure which they disclose was no novelty, and that the royal players from 1583 onwards held this intermediate position as 'grooms in ordinary without fee' between the ordinary and the extraordinary Grooms of the Chamber, we get an explanation of their status which, on the assumption that Howes was not quite well informed, is at least consistent with all the few known facts.

The times and seasons at which plays might be given formed, of course, one of the chief battle-grounds in the controversy with the preachers; and it was here that the Puritans, routed on the main issue of the campaign, were able to secure their principal victory. From the beginning it was an understood thing that plays must not be given during the hours of divine service, either on Sundays, or on the Saints' days, which continued long after the Reformation to be observed as public holidays. This, however, did not prevent the audiences from gathering, so that the play-houses were already full, while the bells were still ringing in the empty services.[4] The City regulations of 1574 attempted to remedy this scandal by extending the prohibition to the opening of the doors. The same point is made in the 'Remedies' put forward by the City advocates in 1584. But there was a practical difficulty, which increased when the theatres in the distant fields or over the water came into use. Afternoon prayer did not begin until 2 p.m., and if the theatres waited until 4 p.m., the performances were not

[1] Sullivan, 250; C. C. Stopes in *Sh.-Jahrbuch*, xlvi. 92; from *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, ii. 48; v. 92, 93. I am not sure whether the velvet was for a 'cap' or a 'cape'. [2] Sullivan, 253; cf. vol. i, p. 52.

[3] Stopes (*supra*). I find a confirmatory note to a Household list of 1641 in *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, iii. 1, 'Note that *the* Companyes of Players under the Titles of the Kings, Queenes, Q*ueene* of Bohemia, Prince & Duke of Yorke are all of them sworne Groomes of the Chamber in ord*inary* w*ithout* fee'. I cannot accept Miss Sullivan's theory that 'without fee' means that the players did not have to buy their places.

[4] Cf. App. C, Nos. xvii, xxxi.

over, except in the height of summer, before dark, and the audiences must make their way home as best they could. The City 'Remedy' for this was a shortening of the plays; but in 1594 Lord Hunsdon suggested that to begin at 2 instead of 4 p.m. might after all be the least of two evils, and this seems to have been the solution ultimately adopted.[1] The proviso against playing in time of common prayer, which finds a place in the licence to Leicester's men of 1574, is not repeated in any of the Jacobean licences, with the exception of Queen Anne's personal warrant to her provincial company in 1606.

Obviously the clash with divine service became of minor importance when the Puritans had made good their protest against plays on Sundays, and when, on the other hand, the theatres came to be open on every week-day, instead of principally on holidays. Both of these processes were complete before the final settlement of the status of players was arrived at.[2] It was the failure to exclude Sundays that above all things made the City regulations of 1574 inadequate in the eyes of the preachers, and formed the leading topic of their railings against the lukewarmness of the 'magistrates'. In the City itself they had gained this point at least by 1581, with the assent of the Privy Council, who, while pressing for the toleration of plays both on ordinary week-days and on holidays, was quite prepared to concede the sanctity of the Sabbath. With the potent aid afforded by the ruin of Paris Garden at a Sunday baiting, the City were able about 1583 to get the principle extended to the suburbs, although both in 1587 and

[1] Platter in 1599 (cf. ch. xvi, introd.) says that plays were given 'alle tag vmb 2 vhren nach mittag'. T. S. Graves, in *E. S.* xlvii. 66, argues in favour of occasional night performances, and is answered by W. J. Lawrence in *E. S.* xlviii. 213. Whatever may have been done before 1574 or thereabouts, I find no later evidence which is not to be explained either by private performances or by a loose use of 'night' for the evening hour at which plays terminated in winter. Nor can I go with Lawrence in supposing an exception for Sunday. The Southwark play at 8 p.m. on Sunday, 12 June 1592, cannot have been at a regular theatre, for there was none within the Lord Mayor's jurisdiction. The allusion in Crosse's *Vertue's Commonwealth* (1603) can quite well be to private plays (cf. App. C), and Henslowe's entry (i. 83) of a loan of 30*s.* 'when they fyrst played Dido at nyght', on Sunday, 8 Jan. 1598, only suggests to me the payment by Henslowe of the shot for a supper after the first performance. Or it may have been a private performance, for Henslowe does not appear (*vide infra*) to have opened the Rose on Sundays.

[2] Cf. App. D, No. xv (1564), 'now daylye, but speciallye on holydayes'; No. xvi (1569), 'on the Saboth dayes and other solempne feastes commaunded by the church to be kept holy'; No. xvii (1571), 'vpon sondaies, holly daies, or other daie of the weke, or ells at night'; No. xxxii (1574), 'on sonndaies and holly dayes, at which tymes such playes weare chefelye vsed'; App. C, No. xxii (1570), 'These because they are allowed to play euery Sunday, make iiii or v Sundayes at least euery weeke'.

in 1591 the Privy Council had to call the attention of the county justices to the neglect of the regulation.[1] In Southwark there is mention of a disturbance at a play on Sunday as late as 11 June 1592, but as the Lord Mayor intervened, this can hardly have been at a regular theatre, for there was only the Rose, which was outside his jurisdiction. On the other hand, the evidence of Henslowe's *Diary*, as interpreted by Dr. Greg, shows that the prohibition was strictly observed at the theatres under his control between 1592 and 1597, and also that the Sunday abstinence was fully compensated for by continuous playing on every other day of the week.[2] It is probable that the proclamation against Sunday plays, issued by James I as one of the first acts of his reign, did no more, so far as London was concerned, than reaffirm an already accepted practice. More puzzling is the provision in the Council order of 1600, whereby each of the two privileged companies was limited to performances on two days in each week. It must be exceedingly doubtful whether this limitation was ever in fact observed. There is no evidence in Henslowe's *Diary* of any slackening in the output of new plays by the Admiral's men after 1600. And there is no corresponding limitation in the Jacobean patents. Moreover, an agreement entered into by Queen Anne's men in June 1615 specifically contemplates performances upon six days a week.

The companies were also expected not to play during Lent. This limitation may have been traditional. It first becomes explicit in the Privy Council's permit of 1578 to the Italian company of Martinelli Drusiano, which is expressed as lasting to the first week in Lent. In the following year a general inhibition for the coming and all subsequent Lents was decreed by the Council. The entries in Henslowe's *Diary* show some observance of the rule during the last decade of the sixteenth century. Strange's men in 1592 played right through Lent, with the exception of Good Friday. The Admiral's men, on the other hand, during 1595 to 1600, seem regularly to have

There was a disorder at the Theatre on Sunday, 10 April 1580, but by July 1581 the Lord Mayor had made an order against Sunday plays, which Berkeley's men disregarded. The Privy Council letter of 3 Dec. 1581 to the City accepts the exclusion of Sunday. Gosson, *Playes Confuted* (1582), 167, and Field (Jan. 1583), C. iii, acknowledge the change of day. When therefore Stubbes (1 March 1583), 137, criticizes Sunday plays, he must have the suburbs in mind. Paris Garden fell on Sunday, 13 Jan. 1583. On 3 July 1583 the Lord Mayor told the Privy Council that Sunday baitings were resumed. The documents of the 1584 controversy, however, state that as a result of the accident, letters were obtained to banish plays (and doubtless also baiting) 'in the places nere London' on the Sabbath days. Whetstone (1584) also alludes to a 'reforme' by the 'magistrate' in this matter.

[2] Henslowe, ii. 324.

broken off for some weeks during Lent. In 1595 and 1596 the interval covered all but the first few days; in 1597 it was less than three weeks, and thereafter the company played three days a week up to Easter. A reservation was made for Lent by the Council order of 1600, and in 1601 the Council sent a special instruction to the Lord Mayor to stop plays at St. Paul's and the Blackfriars during the penitential season. Presumably the same practice prevailed under James I, for the permission to resume playing in April 1604 is expressed as motived by 'the time of Lent being now passt', while on 29 March 1615 representatives of the London companies were summoned before the Privy Council, to answer for playing in Lent contrary to an express direction given them by the Lord Chamberlain through the Master of the Revels.[1] Some light is thrown on this proceeding by the fact that two years later each of the companies undertook to pay the Master of the Revels 44*s.* 'for a Lenten dispensation'.[2]

A Privy Council letter of 1591 imposes one other curious limitation, with which the Puritans at any rate can have had nothing to do, upon the players. They are to lie idle upon Thursdays and leave that day free for bear-baitings and similar pastimes, which were 'allwayes accustomed and practized upon it'. I am not sure whether the claim of the bearwards to Thursday really went back beyond 1583, when it seems to have become desirable, owing to the impulse to Puritan sentiment given by the Paris Garden accident, to substitute some other day for the Sunday upon which baitings had formerly been usual. Nor does it seem that the attempt to give a special protection to the royal 'game' permanently maintained itself. The Admiral's men, in spite of Edward Alleyn's interest in the Bear Garden, certainly did not yield the Thursdays from 1594 to 1597, and when about 1614 Henslowe and Jacob Meade had occasion to combine playing and baiting in the Hope, they had to insert special stipulations in their agreements with the actors, in order to secure one day a fortnight for the bears.[3]

[1] Cf. Middleton, *A Mad World, my Masters* (1608), I. i. 38, ''Tis Lent in your cheeks; the flag's down'; T. Earle, *Microcosmography*, char. 64, of a player, 'Shrove-tuesday hee feares as much as the bawdes, and Lent is more damage to him then the butcher'.

[2] *Variorum*, iii. 65, from Sir Henry Herbert's papers, which also record a similar payment in 1618 'for toleration in the holydays'. Herbert himself sold similar indulgences and in a list of customary Revels fees drawn up in 1662 includes £3 'for Lent fee', together with £3 'for Christmasse fee' (*Variorum*, iii. 266). Prynne, *Histriomastix* (1633), 784, notes the custom of suppressing plays 'in Lent, till now of late'.

[3] Cf. ch. xiii (Lady Elizabeth's). About 1617 Prince Charles's men were

Obviously the privileges given to players were not intended to exempt them from the ordinary duties and responsibilities of citizenship. In the first place, they were called upon to make their contributions to local burdens in the districts in which they set up their play-houses. To this they had probably no objection; on the contrary, they more than once found that a readiness to pay their tithes for the use of the poor was an effective method of smoothing away difficulties with local officials.[1] Nor had they less to gain than others from a reasonable expenditure of money on the repair of the highways.[2]

And secondly, they had to exercise a constant watchfulness against the danger of allowing their play-houses to become the centres of riot and sedition, and the cognate danger of allowing matter to creep into their plays which was contrary to public morals as conceived by those who were not Puritans, or displeasing to persons of importance, or inconsistent with the views of Tudor and Stuart governments upon religious and political questions. The disturbances which form a count in the sixteenth-century indictments of theatres are not particularly conspicuous in the seventeenth. There were bad characters enough, both male and female, amongst the audience. Pockets might be picked and even modesty endangered; and occasionally brawls and bloodshed were the result.[3] But in the more important theatres, such as the Globe and the Fortune, which made their appeal to the well-to-do and the fashionable, no less than to the groundlings,

complaining to Alleyn that 'intemperate Mr. Meade' had taken 'the day from vs which by course was ours'.

[1] By 1574 the City had offers to farm their licensing rights 'to the relefe of the poore in the hospitalles'; but their regulations of Dec. 1574 provide for direct contributions to the poor and sick by holders of licences for playing-places. A weekly subsidy to the poor from every stage is suggested by Walsingham's correspondent of 1587. Hunsdon, in asking for the use of the Cross Keys in 1594, promised that his men would 'be contributories to the poore of the parishe where they plaie accordinge to their habilities'. In 1600 the Southwark Vestry were negotiating with the players for tithes and contributions for the poor on the basis of an 'order taken before my lords of Canterbury and London and the Master of the Revels. In the same year the inhabitants of Finsbury recite the 'very liberall porcion' of money promised weekly for the relief of the poor as one of their grounds for assenting to the building of the Fortune. The accounts of the overseers of Paris Garden between 1611 and 1621 show varying sums, amounting to about £4 or £5 a year, as received during several years from the players at the Swan.

[2] The Middlesex records for 1616 show the Queen's men at the Red Bull as in arrear for their contribution, 'being taxed by the bench 40s. the yeare by theire own consentes'.

[3] Cf. ch. viii.

the maintenance of order was at least as much in the interests of the players themselves as in that of any other section of the community. In avoiding subject-matter of offence, so far as the texts of their plays were concerned, the companies had of course the assistance of the Master of the Revels, upon whom, in view of the unwillingness of the City either to appoint licensing officers themselves or to accept a nominee of the Privy Council, the functions of a stage censor had, as an alternative policy, been conferred.[1] The employment of a royal official for this purpose was in effect a resumption by the central government of a responsibility which it had already attempted to discharge during the earlier Tudor reigns, and had then delegated to the local justices by the proclamation of 1559. The selection of the Master of the Revels explains itself naturally enough as an extension of the duties which already fell to him of scrutinizing and, if need be, 'reforming' the plays proposed for presentation at Court.[2] The actual establishment of his authority appears to have been a gradual process. It is tentative and limited to the plays of one company in the patent for Leicester's men of 1574. It is as wide as possible in the commission issued to the Master in 1581, overriding the proclamation of 1559, and giving him a complete control, not only over individual plays, but over players, playmakers, and playing-places generally. Shortly afterwards, in 1584, the Leicester archives record that the credentials of Worcester's men at that date included, in addition to the warrant from their lord, a licence from the Master of the Revels, from the terms of which it appears that the company were 'bound to the orders prescribed' by him, and in particular that all their plays were to be 'allowed' by him, and to have 'his hand at the latter end of the said booke they doe play'.[3] In London, on the other hand, the correspondence

[1] As far back as 1549 the City had appointed two Secondaries of the Compters to license plays; but this arrangement doubtless terminated when the King and Council assumed the function; cf. ch. ix. In 1572 the Council were pressing the City to appoint 'discreet persons' for the purpose, and in 1574 suggested the suitability of one Mr. Holmes. But the City, who claimed to have had profitable offers to farm the licensing, repeated a former refusal to commit it to any private person. The regulations of 1574 provide for the appointment by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of persons to peruse and allow plays. But the Council are still urging, and the City promising, the appointment of licensers in 1582.

[2] Cf. ch. iii.

[3] The unauthorized company which stole this licence (cf. ch. xiii, s.v. Worcester's) is probably that which appeared as the Master of the Revels' players at Ludlow on 7 Dec. 1583 and at Bath and Gloucester in 1583–4 (Murray, ii. 201, 282, 325). I do not think that Tilney himself had a company. His predecessor had. Plomer (*3 Library*, ix. 252) notes a Canter-

of 1582–4 between the Privy Council and the City makes no mention of the Master, and the Council are still pressing for the appointment of fit persons to consider and allow of plays by the City itself. In 1589, however, the Lord Mayor cited the Master's 'mislike' of the Martin Marprelate plays as a reason for suppressing them, and a step forward was probably taken by the appointment in the same year of a commission to 'allow' plays, consisting of the Master himself and of two assessors nominated by the Lord Mayor and the Archbishop of Canterbury. I find no later reference to these assessors and it may be that before long the Master succeeded in divesting himself of their assistance.[1] In any case, their functions did not go beyond the 'allowing' of the actual plays. The general licensing of companies and of play-houses remained with the Master, and by 1592 we find the City acknowledging their powerlessness to redress the 'inconvenience' of the stage without him and debating the advisability of approaching him with a bribe. Henslowe's *Diary* discloses the Master between 1592 and 1597 as regularly licensing both theatres and plays, and taking fees, which appear to have amounted to 7*s*. for each new play produced, and 5*s*., 6*s*. 8*d*., and ultimately 10*s*. for each week during which a theatre was open.[2] To some extent the assumption of a more direct control by the Privy Council in 1597 must have limited his responsibility. But he continued to act as the agent of the Privy Council or the Lord Chamberlain in transmitting inhibitions and other orders to the companies.[3] Bonds had still to be given to him for the due observance of the regulations.[4] And

bury payment, omitted by Murray, in 1569–70, to 'Syr Thomas Bernars [? Benger's] players, Master of the Quenes Maiesties Revells'. But this was before the Act of 1572.

[1] Possibly the Southwark order for tithes from players, taken before 'my lords of Canterbury and London and the Master of the Revels' about 1600, implies some continuance of the commission. The issue of licences, both for the performance and after 1607 for the printing of plays, 'under the hand of' the Master (cf. ch. xxii), does not exclude the possibility of his acting on the report of an expert assessor, and one is tempted to conjecture that this may have been the position of Segar, who sometimes licensed for the press as deputy to Buck. But it is clear from passages in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book (*Variorum*, iii. 229–42) that he at least personally read the 'books' of plays.

[2] Henslowe, ii. 113, where Dr. Greg *inter alia* disposes of Mr. Fleay's theory that some of the fees entered in the *Diary* are for licences authorizing the publication, not the performance, of plays.

[3] Cf. App. D, No. cliv.

[4] The intruding company of 1598 had not been 'bound' to the Master. The Master's licence to Worcester's men in 1583 is described as an 'indenture of lycense', and the players were 'bound to the orders prescribed by the said Edmund Tyllneye'. On 2 Jan. 1595 Henslowe paid

he still drew fees from the theatres which were in fact again advanced in 1599 from 10*s.* to 15*s.* a week. Due reservation is regularly made for his 'aucthoritie power priuiledges and profittes' in the majority of the Jacobean patents issued to the London companies.[1] He continued to license those travelling companies which held no direct royal authority; and in the course of the seventeenth century he succeeded in establishing his jurisdiction over many travelling entertainers who were not strictly players.[2] Above all, it still rested with him to 'allow' the production, even by the patented companies, of individual plays, and about 1607 he undertook also the allowance of plays for the press, which had previously been in the hands of licensers appointed under the High Commission for London.[3] A few manuscripts of plays are extant which have been submitted to the Master of the Revels for purposes of censorship, notably those of *Sir Thomas More*

the Master £10 'in full payment of a bonde of one hundreth powndes' (Henslowe, i. 39). This looks as if he had forfeited a recognizance.

[1] The licence to the Queen's Revels (1604) is an exception. Here there is no reference to the Master and the allowance of plays is committed to Samuel Daniel 'whome her pleasure is to appoynt for that purpose'. Nor is the Master mentioned in the unexecuted draft (*c.* 1604) for the Queen's men. Probably the reason is to be found in the existence of a separate Chamberlain for the Queen's Household. The Master of the Revels was of course an officer of the King's Lord Chamberlain. The Master's rights are reserved in the patent actually issued to the Queen's men in 1609. Daniel's licensing had been far from a success; cf. p. 326. Oddly enough, whatever Daniel's legal rights, it appears from his exculpation of his *Philotas* (q.v.) that the Master did in fact 'peruse' that play.

[2] A Chamberlain's warrant of 20 Nov. 1622 requires a licence from the Master for any travellers who 'shall shewe or present any play shew motion feats of actiuity and sights whatsoeuer' (Murray, ii. 352). This was motived by certain irregular licences procured 'both from the Kings Maiestie and also from diuerse noblemen'. The commission of 1581 is wide enough to cover all 'shewes'; possibly the actual practice was extended when the Act of 1604 restricted the protection of noblemen to players of interludes proper—a restriction evidently still imperfectly observed in 1622. The earliest licence for a non-dramatic show on record is one of date earlier than 5 Oct. 1605 to John Watson, ironmonger, 'to shewe two beasts called Babonnes' (Murray, ii. 338; cf. ch. xxiv, s.v. *Sir G. Goosecap*), and this was a royal warrant, perhaps under the signet. But on 6 Sept. 1610 Buck issued a licence to 'shew a strange lion, brought to do strange things, as turning an ox to be roasted, &c.' (*S. P. D. Jac. I*, lvii. 45), and the keeper of a 'motion' in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), v. 5, 18, says, 'I have the Master of the *Reuell's* hand for it'. Later examples of signet warrants for shows are in Murray, ii. 342, and of licences from the Master in Murray, ii. 351 sqq., and Herbert, 46; cf. Gildersleeve, 64, 72.

[3] Cf. ch. xxii. Herbert noted at the Restoration (*Dramatic Records*, 96), 'Severall playes allowed by Mister Tilney in 1598. As Sir William Longsword allowed to be acted in 1598, The Fair Maid of London. Richard Cor de Lyon. See the Bookes.'

(*c.* 1600) and *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* (1611), and give interesting indications of the manner in which he apprehended his duties.[1] Tilney, in dealing with *Sir Thomas More*, was perturbed by two features. The play, as submitted to him, began with a dispute between Londoners and certain Lombard aliens, leading up to the riots of 'ill May day' and the reputation won by Sir Thomas More as the restorer of peace. This was still a ticklish subject at the end of the sixteenth century, for there had been comparatively recent disturbances on the alien question, directed against Frenchmen rather than Lombards, and Tilney therefore went carefully through the earlier pages, altering here and there 'Frenchman' or 'straunger' into 'Lombard', and marking for omission or alteration certain passages which might be read as suggestions to the citizens to take matters into their own hands. In the margin of one passage he wrote 'Mend this'. Presumably the effect of these 'reformations' did not satisfy him, for at the beginning of the first scene he has inserted what Dr. Greg calls 'a very conditional licence', but what is in fact a direction for the complete recast of the first part of the play by the omission of the dangerous episodes.[2] Similarly he was pulled up by a later scene in which More's refusal to sign articles sent him by the King seemed to be of bad precedent for subjects, and here he drew a line through a substantial section of the dialogue, and added a note that all must be altered. *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is a Jacobean, not an Elizabethan, play, and the censor was Sir George Buck. He, too, is on the look-out for political criticism, and political criticism in 1611 was likely to be criticism of King and Court. The passages, therefore, amended by Buck or at his instigation are a few which speak lightly of courtiers and knights and ladies of high position, and one in particular which seemed to him to dwell with too much point and detail upon the delicate theme of tyrannicide. But this was merely verbal caution. He did not attempt to eliminate tyrannicide

[1] The manuscript of *The Honest Man's Fortune* (1613) has some censorial notes and an allowance at the end of the book by Herbert on the occasion of a revival in 1625. Of later manuscripts, that of *Sir John Van Olden Barnevelt* (Bullen, *O. E. P.* ii. 101) has corrections by Herbert, but no allowance, and that of Massinger's *Believe As You List* (facs. in *T. F. T.*) is a second draft, prepared to meet criticisms by Herbert, and allowed by him; cf. Gildersleeve, 114, 123.

[2] The extent to which Tilney's handiwork is apparent in the text is a matter of great palaeographical difficulty fully studied by Dr. Greg, who takes the view that the insertions and many of the corrections in the manuscript were made before it was submitted to Tilney, and are not an attempt to carry out the revision directed by him. If so, he was very easy-going as regards willingness to peruse a most disorderly text.

from the plot, in which it formed an essential element, and returned the copy duly endorsed with a licence over his signature that it 'may with the reformations bee acted publikely'. One more point shows some development of censorial practice as between Tilney and Buck. The latter, presumably with the *Act to Restrain Abuses of Players* in his mind, concerns himself not only with politics but with propriety. It is a perfunctory business enough. In half a dozen places such expletives as 'life' and 'heart' are excised; in many more these and others, such as 'mass' and 'faith', which one would have supposed to be as much or as little objectionable, remain unquestioned.[1]

It has been the experience of many governments that the most rigid censorship of the 'books' of plays does not afford a complete guarantee of the inoffensiveness of the performances actually given upon the stage. A few lines of 'gag' are easily inserted; an emphasis, a gesture, a 'make-up' may fill with malicious intention a scene which read harmlessly enough in the privacy of the censor's study. And as nothing draws like topical allusions, it sometimes happened that the activities of the Master of the Revels did not prevent the players from overstepping the boundaries of what the somewhat arbitrary susceptibilities of the government would tolerate. It must not be supposed that the Elizabethan injunction against any intermeddling with politics or religion on the stage was to be taken with absolute literalness. Up to a point the players had a fairly free hand even with contemporary events. They might represent, if they would, such feats of English arms as the siege of Turnhout with all realism.[2] They might mock at foreign potentates, if they did not, as was sometimes the

[1] Herbert (*Variorum*, iii. 235) records a conversation between Charles I and himself about the language of Davenant's *Wits*, at the end of which he noted in his office-book, 'The Kinge is pleased to take faith, death, slight, for asseverations and no oaths, to which I doe humbly submit as my masters judgment; but under favour conceive them to be oaths, and enter them here, to declare my opinion and submission'. I also find Herbert occasionally expurgating 'obsceanes' and 'ribaldry' from plays (*Variorum*, iii. 208, 232, 241). But it is obvious from extant texts that neither he nor his predecessors made any attempt to enforce a high standard of decency.

[2] R. Whyte to Sir R. Sidney on 26 Oct. 1599 (*Sydney Papers*, ii. 136), 'Two daies agoe, the ouerthrow of *Turnholt*, was acted vpon a Stage, and all your Names vsed that were at yt; especially *Sir Fra. Veres*, and he that plaid that Part gott a Beard resembling his, and a Watchet Sattin Doublett, with Hose trimd with Siluer Lace. You was also introduced, Killing, Slaying, and Overthrowing the *Spaniards*, and honorable Mention made of your Service, in seconding *Sir Francis Vere*, being engaged'. Turnhout was taken from the Spanish by Count Maurice of Nassau, with the help of an English contingent, on 24 Jan. 1598.

case, embarrass Elizabeth's diplomacy in so doing.[1] It has already been made clear that at the beginning of the reign Cecil made use of interludes, after the manner of his master Cromwell, as a political weapon against Philip of Spain and the Catholics; and many years after both Philip and James of Scotland had their grievances against the freedom with which their names were bandied by the London comedians.[2] Similarly, when it was desired that Puritanism should be unpopular, the players were not debarred from satirizing Puritans.[3] But if the public discussion of religious contro-

[1] Winwood to Cecil from Paris on 7 July 1602 (Winwood, i. 425), 'Upon Thursday last, certain Italian comedians did set up upon the corners of the passages in this towne that that afternoone they would play *l'Histoire Angloise contre la Roine d'Angleterre*'. Winwood protested and secured an inhibition, but 'It was objected to me before the Counsaile by some Standers by, that the Death of the Duke of Guise hath ben plaied at London; which I answered was never done in the life of the last King; and sence, by some others, that the Massacre of St. Bartholomews hath ben publickly acted, and this King represented upon the stage'. The play introducing Henri IV was probably a revival by the Admiral's men of Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris*, for which Henslowe was making advances in Nov. 1601 and Jan. 1602; cf. Bk. III. Evidently Elizabeth got as good as she gave on the stage. On 2 June 1598 Dr. Fletcher describes to Sir R. Cecil (*Hatfield MSS.* viii. 190) a recent dumb show at Brussels in which she was mocked at. On 7 June 1598 one Mr. Hungerford describes to Essex (*Hatfield MSS.* viii. 197) another, or perhaps the same, show at Antwerp, in which also she appeared. In Oct. 1607 Walter Yonge records in his *Diary* (Camden Soc.), 15, a play at the Jesuit College of Lyons. It lasted two days, and employed 100 actors. An abbess played the Virgin. Calvin, Luther, and others 'with our late good Queen Elizabeth, condemned', were represented. The episodes included 'the meritorious deed intended of gunpowder; the conspiracy of Babington, and others, against Queen Elizabeth; all which were rewarded with the joys of Paradise'. Yonge adds that a storm broke, and 'the three resembling the Trinity, and the abbess were stricken with the hand of the Lord, and it was never known what became of them'. He says that books were printed about the incident; there are in fact no less than five recorded in Arber, iii. 361–4 (cf. App. M).

[2] Cf. ch. viii. On 20 July 1586 the Venetian ambassador in Spain reported (*V. P.* viii. 182) Philip's resentment at 'the masquerades and comedies which the Queen of England orders to be acted at his expense. His Majesty has received a summary of one of these which was lately represented, in which all sorts of evil is spoken of the Pope, the Catholic religion, and the King, who is accused of spending all his time in the Escurial with the monks of St. Jerome, attending only to his buildings, and a hundred other insolences which I refrain from sending to your Serenity'. This is confirmed by Collier, i. 279, from a manuscript *Declaration of the True Causes of the Great Troubles supposed to be Intended against the Realm of England* (1592). On 15 April 1598 George Nicolson wrote from Edinburgh to Burghley (*Sc. P.* ii. 749), 'It is regretted that the comedians of London should scorn the king and the people of this land in their play; and it is wished that the matter should be speedily amended lest the king and the country be stirred to anger'.

[3] Cf. ch. viii.

versies became a scandal, as in the case of the Marprelate plays, and still more if freedom of speech turned to criticism of the government itself, as probably happened in *The Isle of Dogs*, it very soon became apparent that the time for toleration was over, and the punishment which fell upon the companies was swift and sharp and undiscriminating. Sometimes it even happened, in spite of the special pains of the Master of Revels, that a play was brought to Court which gave offence. Such a play had to be stopped incontinently during the Christmas of 1559, and another is recorded at a much later date, which drew some displeasing political morals from the suits of a pack of cards, and would have brought the performers into serious disgrace but for the friendly intervention of a councillor with a sense of humour.[1] In addition to the susceptibilities of the government itself, there were also those of powerful individuals to be considered. Cecilia of Sweden, who had outstayed her welcome, complained that her husband was mocked by the players in her presence.[2] Tarlton, although a *persona grata* at Court, got into trouble for his hits at Leicester and Raleigh, possibly in the very play on the pack of cards already mentioned.[3] A protest from a descendant of Sir John Oldcastle obliged Shakespeare to change the original name of his Falstaff. And on 10 May 1601 the Privy Council sent an order to the Middlesex justices to examine and, if need be, suppress a play at the Curtain, in which were presented 'the persons of some gentlemen of good desert and quality that are yet alive, under obscure manner, but yet in such sort as all the hearers may take notice both of the matter and of the persons that are meant thereby'. A rather inexplicable part was taken by players in the wild scenes that closed the career of Robert Earl of Essex in 1601. Essex was a popular hero, and as the prologue to *Henry V* shows, a name to conjure with in the theatre. Bacon records how in August 1599, after his return from Ireland, 'did fly about in London streets and theatres seditious libels'.[4] That he should become an object of ridicule rather than of honour on the boards was one of the bitterest stings in his disgrace. 'Shortly', he wailed to Elizabeth on 12 May 1600, 'they will

[1] Cf. App. C, No. xlv.

[2] *S. P. F.* xi. 567. Cecilia complained to her brother, King John of Sweden, 'Another time she being bidden to see a comedy played, there was a black man brought in, and as he was of an evil favoured countenance, so was he in like manner full of lewd, spiteful and scornful words, which she said represented the marquis, her husband'.

[3] Burn, 153, notes from *Lansd. MS.* 232, that the Star Chamber inflicted a severe punishment for the impersonation of Leicester in a play.

[4] Bacon (Spedding, ix. 177), *The Proceedings of the Earl of Essex.*

play me in what forms they list upon the stage.' [1] And when the last mad step of rebellion was taken in February 1601 it was a play, none other than Shakespeare's *Richard II*, to which the plotters looked to stir the temper of London in their favour.[2] The curious thing is that in this case, although Essex and more than one of his followers lost life or liberty, no very serious results seem to have followed to the company involved. The incident has been thought to have inspired the references to an 'innovation' and the consequent travelling of the players in *Hamlet*. But in fact the Chamberlain's men cannot be traced in the provinces during 1601, and they were admitted to give their full share of Court performances during the following Christmas.[3]

For some years after the coming of James, the freedom of speech adopted by the stage, in a London much inclined to be critical of the alien King and his retinue of hungry Scots, was far beyond anything which could have been tolerated by Elizabeth. The uncouth speech of the Sovereign, his intemperance, his gusts of passion, his inordinate devotion to the chase, were caricatured with what appears incredible audacity, before audiences of his new subjects. 'Consider for pity's sake,' writes Beaumont, the French ambassador, on 14 June 1604, 'what must be the state and condition of a prince, whom the preachers publicly from the pulpit assail, whom the comedians of the metropolis bring upon the stage, whose wife attends these representations in order to enjoy the laugh against her husband.' [4] Beaumont's evidence is confirmed by a letter of 28 March 1605 from Samuel Calvert to Ralph Winwood, in which he writes that 'the play[er]s do not forbear to represent upon their stage the whole course of this present time, not sparing either King, state, or religion, in so great absurdity, and with such liberty, that any would be afraid to hear them'.[5] That in spite of all the companies continued to enjoy a substantial measure of royal favour, while speaking well for the good sense of the government,

[1] *S. P. D. Eliz.* cclxxiv. 138. [2] Cf. ch. xiii (Chamberlain's).

[3] It is probably unnecessary to take literally Arabella Stuart's letter of 16 Feb. 1603 to Edward Talbot (Bradley, *Arabella Stuart*, i. 128; ii. 119), 'I am as unjustly accused of contriving a comedy, as you (on my conscience) a tragedy'.

[4] Von Raumer, ii. 206.

[5] Winwood, ii. 54. Furnivall, *Stubbes*, 79*, tried in vain to identify a manuscript tract on the abusive attacks of players stated by Haslewood in *Gentleman's Magazine* (1816), lxxxvi. 1. 205, to be in the British Museum. Possibly it was *Sloane MS.* 3543, ff. 19^{v}, 49, a *Treatise Apologeticall for Huntinge*, which refers to the 'taxation' of James on the stage for his love of sport; cf. R. Simpson in *N. S. S. Trans.* (1874), 375, and E. J. L. Scott in *Athenaeum* (1896), i. 756.

may perhaps also justify the inference that by the seventeenth century the theatre had so far established itself as an integral part of London life that a vindictive measure of suppression had become impracticable. From time to time, however, the blow fell upon some unusually indiscreet company, or playwright, and at one moment, owing to diplomatic complications, the prospect of suppression became, as will be seen, an imminent danger. Possibly the countenance given by Queen Anne to the comedians may have been in part responsible for the long-suffering with which their insolence was met. It could have been no object for James to underline by any public action the strained relations between King and Consort which already embarrassed the conduct of Court life. One of the companies, indeed, which was most frequently in trouble, was that which had been taken in 1604 under the direct protection of the Queen, with the title of 'Children of the Queen's Revels'. This was a company of boys, in a sense attached to the Court itself and formerly known as the Children of the Chapel, which played at the 'private' house of the Blackfriars under conditions not quite the same as those of the public theatres. The patent under which this company was reconstructed in 1604 had exempted its plays from the jurisdiction of the Master of the Revels, possibly because the Master was an officer of the King's Household from which that of the Queen was distinct, and had committed the licensing of them to the poet Samuel Daniel, who had been nominated by Anne for the purpose. Daniel was extremely unfortunate in the exercise of his functions. Before a year was out, offence had already been given by the play of *Philotas*, of which he was himself the author. In 1605 followed *Eastward Ho!* with some audacious satire upon the Scottish nation, which brought Jonson and Chapman into prison, although they maintained that the offending 'clawses' were due not to their pens, but to those of their collaborator Marston, who had apparently made his escape. As a result of the misdemeanour of *Eastward Ho!* Anne appears to have been induced to withdraw her direct patronage of the company, which for a time was known, not as the Children of the Queen's Revels, but as the Children of the Revels pure and simple. But it was allowed to go on playing at the Blackfriars, and here in February 1606 was produced Day's *Isle of Gulls*, another satire on the relations of English and Scots, which landed some of those responsible in Bridewell. Further irregularities took place in 1608, of which a lively account is given in a dispatch of the French ambassador, M. de la Boderie. The company produced two offending plays in rapid succession. Of one, now lost, which

satirized James in person, the author was probably John Marston. The other, which provoked the ambassador to protest by its allusions to the domestic arrangements of the French king, was Chapman's *Byron*.[1] A general inhibition of plays was now ordered, but De La Boderie correctly anticipated that James's anger would soon be mollified, especially as the four other London companies had offered an indemnity which he estimates at what seems the incredibly high figure of 100,000 francs. He thought that similar episodes would be prevented in future by refusing allowance to plays whose subjects were taken from contemporary history. This may, in fact, have been the solution adopted, as a standing order against the representation of any 'modern Christian King' on the stage is quoted in 1624.[2] Clearly, however, it left the even more dangerous resources of allegory and of historical parallel still open to the 'seditious' playwright.[3] The Revels boys seem again to have been in trouble in 1610 owing to an offence taken by Lady Arabella Stuart at a passage of Ben Jonson's *Epicoene*, which she seems to have misunderstood.

The Paul's boys vaunt their abstention from libels in the prologue to their *Woman Hater* of 1606. But it must not be supposed that the dramatic indiscretions were limited to a single company. Even the King's men themselves, though probably without any intention to offend, sometimes misjudged the limits of what was permissible. The Earl of Northampton haled Ben Jonson before the Privy Council for his *Sejanus* of 1603. On 18 December 1604 a Court gossip

[1] Cf. ch. xii (Chapel).

[2] Sir Edward Conway to the Privy Council, 12 Aug. 1624 (Chalmers, *Apology*, 500, from *S. P. D. Charles I*, clxxi. 39), 'His Majesty remembers well there was a commandment and restraint given against the representing of any modern Christian Kings in those stage-plays'. This was written about the performance of Middleton's *A Game of Chess*, reflecting on the Spanish policy of James I, by the King's men; cf. *M. S. C.* i. 379. Other post-Shakespearian indiscretions were a performance of a play on the Marquis D'Ancre by an unnamed company in 1617 (*M. S. C.* i. 376), and one of *Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt* by the King's men in 1619 (Bullen, *O. E. P.* iv. 381, from *S. P. D. James* cx. 37); cf. Gildersleeve, 113.

[3] This work is not directly concerned with the literary content of stage-plays. But I may be allowed to express the opinion that the search for the 'topical' in Elizabethan drama has been pushed beyond the limits of good sense. Thus I agree with P. W. Long, *The Purport of Lyly's Endimion* (*M. L. A.* xxiv. 164), that there is little ground for the elaborate theories of a dramatization of Elizabeth's personal amours propounded successively by N. J. Halpin, *Oberon's Vision* (*Sh. Soc.* 1843), G. P. Baker, *Lyly's Endymion* (1894), xli, and R. W. Bond, *Works of Lyly* (1902), iii. 81. Similarly the conjectures of R. Simpson in his *School of Shakespeare* (1878) and elsewhere, and of Fleay, and of most of the writers, other than Small, on the 'war of the theatres' require handling with the utmost caution.

writes of a play of *Gowry*, no longer extant, that ' whether the matter or the manner be not well handled, or that it be thought unfit that Princes should be played on the stage in their lifetime, I hear that some great councellors are much displeased with it, and so 'tis thought shall be forbidden '.[1] A somewhat vague allusion to an ' unwilling error ' of players and a consequent restraint, contained in the epilogue for a revival of *Mucedorus*, first published in 1610, may possibly relate to some later episode not otherwise recorded, but possibly only to the *Byron* episode, with which the King's men had nothing directly to do. Nor do we know who were the ' much-suffering actors ' of Daborne's ' oppressed and much-martird Tragedy ', *A Christian Turned Turk*, of about the same date. Conceivably this is itself the play for which *Mucedorus* apologizes. Even provincial plays sometimes brought their promoters before the Star Chamber. Sir Edward Dymock was imprisoned and fined £1,000 in May 1610 for a scurrilous play against the Earl of Lincoln on a Maypole green.[2] And what seems a curiously belated incident is recorded in 1614, when Sir John Yorke suffered a similar fate for encouraging some vagrant players to perform an interlude in favour of the Popish religion.[3]

And when players had got their warrants and their licences, and signed their recognizances to the Master of the Revels, and paid their tithes, and made up their minds to observe the taboos of Sunday and of Lent, and to purge their plays of all perilous stuff, they had still to encounter the ordinary changes

[1] Winwood, ii. 41. [2] Gildersleeve, 108, from *Hist. MSS.* iii. 57.

[3] 7 *N. Q.* iii. 126; *Hist. MSS.* iii. 62; *S. P. D. Jac. I*, lxxvii. 58 (John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton); Burn, 78, from *Harl. MS.* 1227. Yorke was fined and imprisoned with his wife and brothers, ' pur admittinge de certeigne comon players (viz^t^) les Simpsons de player en son meason un enterlude in q. la fuit disputation perenter Popish preist et English minister et le preist est de convince le minister in argument et le weapon de le minister esteant le bible et le preist le crosse et le Diabole fuit counterfeit la de prender le English minister et son Angle prist le preist per q. enterlude le religion ore profeste fuit grandment scandall et pluss del audience fueront recusants. . . . Le cheife Justice [Coke ?] dit q. players de enterludes sont Rogues per le statute . . . et le very bringing de religion sur le stage est libell.' On the career of the Simpsons, cf. ch. ix. The actual offence may have been some years earlier than the Star Chamber sitting of 1614, for Devon, 261, records a payment to the Keeper of the Gatehouse at Westminster for the diet of Lady Julian, wife of Sir John Yorke, as a prisoner from 5 Nov. 1611 to 13 Oct. 1613. The Yorkes were not of those who learn by experience, for in 1628 the Star Chamber sentenced Christopher Malloy for playing the devil in a performance at Sir John Yorke's house in Yorkshire, in which part he carried King James on his back to hell, and alleged that all Protestants were damned (Burn, 119).

and chances incident to all mortality. The profits swelled in term time and dwindled in vacation.[1] Easter, Whitsuntide, Bartholomew Fair, were recurring seasons of prosperity.[2] Were the streets full for such an occasion as the entry of an ambassador, the theatres reaped their harvest.[3] A period of public mourning, on the other hand, as at the deaths of Elizabeth and of Prince Henry, meant the cessation of business.[4] Political changes—although, like the other elements of Stuart society, the players probably paid little attention to the forces that were gathering for their ultimate overthrow—might prove more disastrous still. But the dreaded enemy, in whose mysterious workings the Puritans recognized a direct expression of the wrath of God, was undeniably the plague. The menace, and too often the actual reality, of plague, in a city whose growth had far outstripped the advance of sanitary knowledge, was one of the principal domestic preoccupations of Elizabethan administrators. And the precaution, which was always resorted to, of forbidding public assemblies as probable centres of infection, reacted terribly upon theatrical enterprise. A study of the plague calendar which forms an appendix to the present volumes will show that there were three grave visitations of plague during the years which it covers, in 1563, in 1592–4, and in 1603; that in the long period 1564 to 1587 following the first visitation, and in the shorter period 1604 to 1609 following the third visitation, plague had become endemic, generally showing itself from July to November and reaching its maximum in September or October; that during these periods certain years, such as 1579 and 1580 in the one and 1604 in the other were comparatively free; and that probably during 1588–91, and certainly during 1595–1602 and 1610–16, plague was so far absent as to be practically negligible. In fact, after 1609 plague did not again become a serious factor in London

[1] Dekker, *Work for Armourers* (1609, *Works*, iv. 96), 'Tearme times, when the Twopeny Clients and Peny Stinkards swarme together to heere the Stagerites'.

[2] Dekker, *The Dead Tearme* (1608, *Works*, iv. 22), of Bartholomewtide, 'when thou (O thou beautifull, but bewitching Citty) . . . allurest people from all the corners of the land, to throng in heapes, at thy Fayres and thy Theators'.

[3] Dekker, *Seven Deadly Sins of London* (1606, *Works*, ii. 52), 'The players prayd for his [Sloth's] comming: they lost nothing by it, the comming in of tenne Embassadors was never so sweete to them, as this our sinne was: their houses smoakt every after noone with Stinkards who were so glewed together in crowdes with the steames of strong breath, that when they came foorth, their faces lookt as if they had beene perboyld'.

[4] Cf. App. D, Nos. cxxxi, cli.

life until 1625. The greatest developments of the Elizabethan drama thus coincide with the longest periods of exemption, and perhaps this simple physical fact has something to do with the break-down of the Puritan opposition and the settlement of theatrical conditions in 1597. Certainly the plague-some years 1564–87 are marked by a series of inhibitions of plays on account of plague, some of which seem to be hardly justified by the actual state of things prevailing, and suggest that the Privy Council occasionally found it convenient to avoid controversy with the City by acquiescing in an inhibition for which the dread of infection was little more than the ostensible reason. This tendency seems to have come very near to bringing about a regular autumnal close season for plays. Ultimately, however, a different principle of regulation was adopted. This was based upon the showings of the plague-bill, a weekly summary of deaths from plague and from other causes respectively, prepared from returns rendered on behalf of each of the 109 parishes within the City area and a few of those in the suburbs.[1] The first indication of an appeal to this criterion is to be found in the documents belonging to the inquiry of 1584, to which the players appear to have contributed the proposal that their activities should continue to be tolerated so long as the deaths from plague in any one week did not exceed fifty. The City questioned the security afforded by this figure, and as an alternative offered toleration whenever the deaths from all causes should have remained below fifty for three weeks together. It is difficult to say whether this reply was intended to be taken seriously. Probably not, in view of the general attitude adopted in the argument of which it forms part. If it had been applied to the years 1578–82, for which plague-bills are extant, there would have been only fifteen weeks of playing during the five years, six weeks in 1580, and nine weeks in 1581.[2] The precise issue of the discussion of 1584 is unknown; but the principle then mooted is found in effective operation during the seventeenth century. Most of the patents do not make any specific reservation for times of plague, but that for the King's men, issued during the plague of 1603, and the unexecuted draft for the Queen's men are expressed as coming into operation 'when the infection of the plague shall decrease', and more precisely in the case of the Queen's men 'when the infeccion of the plague shall decrease to the nomber of thirtie weekly within our Citie of London and the liberties therof'. Similarly the Privy Council letter of 9 April 1604 in allowance

[1] Cf. App. E.

[2] The full tables are in Murray, ii. 181.

of the resumption of plays is guarded by the proviso 'except there shall happen weeklie to die of the plague aboue the number of thirtie within the Cittie of London and the liberties therof; att which time we think it fitt they shall cease and forbeare any further publicklie to playe untill the sicknes be again decreaced to the saide number'. This criterion of thirty deaths was much less favourable to the players than that of fifty which they had themselves suggested in 1584. It appears to have ruled until about 1607 and then to have been replaced by the more liberal allowance of forty, which is the number specified in the later patents of 1619 and 1625 to the King's men.[1]

It is clear that a plague, if at all prolonged, hit the players very hard, partly because it was customary to divide up the profits weekly or even daily, and the companies, as distinct from prudent individuals, seem to have kept no reserve funds. In particular the plague of 1592–4 forms a regular watershed in the history of the companies. Some went under altogether; others, such as the famous Queen's men, failed for ever after to recover a foothold in the metropolis. The reconstructed organizations of 1594 have practically no continuity with those in existence up to 1592. The obvious resource in a time of inhibition was to travel, since a London plague did not necessarily extend far into the provinces.[2] It was a regrettable necessity. In favourable economic conditions, the London companies tended to grow, to effect amalgamations, to occupy more than one theatre.[3] Travelling, for more than a few

[1] *Your Five Gallants* (1607), iv. 2. 30, 'If the bill down rise to above thirty, here's no place for players' (cf. App. E, s. a. 1605); *Ram Alley* (1607–8), iv. 1, 'I dwindle as a new player does at a plague bill certefied forty'. Thorndike, *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher upon Shakespeare*, 16, doubts whether the theatres can in fact have been wholly closed from Aug. 1608 to Dec. 1609, when the bill was almost continuously over 40. I think that Murray, ii. 175, sufficiently answers some of his points, but in *Shakespeare's Theater*, 241, he cites *Keysar v. Burbage* (cf. ch. xii, s.v. Chapel) as evidence that the King's played at Blackfriars during the plague season of 1609. Both disputants seem to have overlooked the special payments to the King's men (App. B) for private practice before the Christmases of 1608–9 and 1609–10. It is possible that they were allowed, in spite of a general restraint, to use the Blackfriars for this purpose, and even admit a select audience. If a similar relaxation was given to the Revels at Whitefriars, the dating of *Epicoene* in '1609' would be explained. I do not agree with Murray that it is likely to have been produced in the provinces. After all, the plague bill was well under 40 by 7 Dec. 1609, although it went up to 39 again on 28 Dec.

[2] In 1574, a restraint covers 10 miles from the city; in 1581 (a civic precept), 2 miles; in 1593, 7 miles; in 1594, 5 miles; in 1597, 3 miles.

[3] Cf. App. D, Nos. lxxii, lxxv, and the use of the Curtain as an 'easer'

summer weeks, meant the reduction of establishments to the level of provincial profits, the breaking up of partnerships, the division of books and apparel, the dismissal of hired men.[1] But plague was inexorable. Reluctantly the drums and trumpets were bought, the last stoup was quaffed at the Cardinal's Hat, and the rufflers of London streets resigned themselves to the hard life of country 'strowlers'.[2] On the road, with his wagon, the actor necessarily laid aside the conditions of a householder, and reverted to those of his grandfather, the minstrel.[3] And it is fair to say that, as a rule, although there were Puritans in the provinces as well as in London, he received a minstrel's welcome. His advent, about 1574, to a western borough is thus described by one

to the Theatre (ch. xvi); also the relations of the Admiral's and Strange's during 1589–94.

[1] Strange's men petitioned *c.* 1592 (App. D, No. xcii), 'oure Companie is greate, and thearbie our chardge intollerable, in travellinge the Countrie, and the contynuance thereof wilbe a meane to bringe vs to division and seperacion'. My impression is that, when they did have to travel in 1592 or 1593, Pembroke's (cf. ch. xiii) budded off from them. Their own travelling warrant was for 6 men, but this does not exclude hirelings. The provincial records do not give much evidence as to the actual size of travelling companies. The strength of seven companies which visited Southampton in 1576–7 (Murray, ii. 396) ranged from 6 to 12. I incline to agree with Murray and W. J. Lawrence (*T. L. S.*, 21 Aug. 1919) that the average may be put at about 10 for the latter part of the sixteenth century and that it grew in the seventeenth. A Lord Chamberlain's licence of 1621 (Murray, ii. 192) sets a limit of 18. Probably 10 men, duplicating parts, could play many of the London plays without alteration, but obviously not the more spectacular ones.

[2] Dekker, *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603, *Works*, i. 100), 'The worst players Boy stood vpon his good parts, swearing tragicall and busking oathes, that how vilainously soeuer he randed, or what bad and vnlawfull action soeuer he entred into, he would in despite of his honest audience be halfe a sharer (at leaste) at home, or else strowle (thats to say trauell) with some notorious wicked floundring company abroad'; *News from Hell* (1606, *Works*, ii. 146), 'a companie of country players, . . . that with strowling were brought to deaths door'; *Belman of London* (1608, *Works*, iii. 81), 'Nor Players they bee, who out of an ambition to weare the best Ierkin (in a Strowling company) or to Act great Parts, forsake the stately and our more than Romaine Cittie Stages, to trauel vpon the hard hoofe from village to village for chees & butter-milke'; *Lanthorne and Candlelight* (1608, *Works*, iii. 255), 'Strowlers; a proper name given to country players that (without socks) trotte from towne to towne vpon the hard hoofe'; *The Raven's Almanac* (1609, *Works*, iv. 196), 'Players, by reason they shal have a hard winter, and must travell on the hoofe, will lye sucking there for pence and twopences, like young pigges at a sow newly farrowed'.

[3] 'Paid to the plaiers with the waggon' (Exeter, 1576–7); 'Misdemeanoure done in the towne vppon misusage of a wagon or coache of the Lo. Bartlettes [Berkeley's] players' (Faversham, 1596–7); Dekker, *Satiromastix*, 1522, of Horace-Jonson, 'Thou hast forgot how thou amblest (in leather pilch) by a play-wagon, in the high way'; cf. ch. xi.

R. Willis, in a half-autobiographical, half-religious, treatise entitled *Mount Tabor*, published in 1639:[1]

'In the City of *Gloucester*, the manner is (as I think it is in other like corporations) that when Players of Enterludes come to towne, they first attend the Mayor, to enforme him what noble-mans servants they are, and so to get licence for their publike playing; and if the Mayor like the Actors, or would shew respect to their Lord and Master, he appoints them to play their first play before himselfe, and the Aldermen and common Counsell of the City; and that is called the Mayors play, where every one that will comes in without money, the Mayor giving the players a reward as hee thinks fit, to shew respect unto them. At such a play my father tooke me with him, and made me stand betweene his leggs, as he sate upon one of the benches, where wee saw and heard very well.'

The account given by Willis receives general confirmation from the numerous entries with regard to players exhumed from the municipal archives not only of Gloucester itself, but of many other towns, and notably Canterbury, Dover, Southampton, Winchester, Exeter, Plymouth, Barnstaple, Oxford, Abingdon, Marlborough, Bath, Bristol, Shrewsbury, Chester, York, Newcastle, Nottingham, Leicester, Coventry, Stratford-on-Avon, Maldon, Ipswich, Cambridge, and Norwich.[2] As a rule the information consists of a record in the annual accounts rendered by the Chamberlains or other borough treasurers of the 'rewards' paid to the companies for performing the 'Mayor's play'. These are often stated to have been paid at the 'appointment' of the Mayor, or of the Mayor and the Aldermen or other body who were his 'brethren'. The name of the company is generally given; sometimes the date of the performances, and more rarely the name of the play or some other detail which struck the fancy of the Chamberlains, is added. Sometimes, moreover, there is subsidiary expenditure to record; a stage has to be put up and lit;[3] damage done has to be repaired;[4] the players

[1] R. W., *Mount Tabor*, 110 (repr. Harrison, iv. 355), *Upon a Stage-play which I saw when I was a child.* The play was the morality of *The Castle of Security*; cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 189.

[2] Cf. *Bibl. Note* to ch. xii.

[3] 'For lynks to give light in the euenyng' (Bristol, 1577); 'for candells and torches then spent' (Canterbury, 1574); 'for the skafowld' (Exeter, 1604–5); 'to make a scaffolde in the Bothall' (Gloucester, 1559–60, with similar entries in other years up to 1568); 'a pounde of candelles' (Gloucester, 1561–2); 'for nayles . . . for layeing the tymber off ye stage together' (Maidstone, 1568–9); 'bordes that was borowed for to make a skaffold to the Halle' (Nottingham, 1572); 'for bearinge of bordes and other furniture' (Plymouth, 1580–1); 'for setting up stoopes for players' (Stafford, *c.* 1616).

[4] 'For amendynge the seelynge in the Guildhall that the Enterlude

are entertained with the municipal courtesy of 'wine and sugar', or with a 'drinkinge', 'banket', or 'breakfast' at their inn.[1] At Gloucester the entertainment, of 'wine and chirries', took place in the house of 'Mr. Swordbearer', an official of the corporation. In the main the customs of the different towns seem to have been singularly uniform, but here and there variations of detail present themselves. Thus the mayor's play was not everywhere, as at Gloucester, open to all comers. A 'free' play is noted at Newcastle; at Bath and Canterbury on the other hand there was a 'gathering', supplemented by the town's reward.[2] At Leicester the same arrangement prevailed up to the end of the sixteenth century. The 'gathering' was levied upon the members of the two councils known as the 'Twenty-four' and the 'Forty-eight'; and orders are upon record limiting this liability to performances by the royal companies or the servants of privy councillors.[3] In 1590–1 collections were also taken 'at the hall dore'.

players had broken downe there this yeare' (Barnstaple, 1593–4); 'for mending the bord in the Yeld hall and the doers there, after my L. of Leycesters players who had leave to play there' (Bristol, 1577–8); 'for mending of ii forormes which were taken out of S[t] George Chapple and set in the Yeld hall at the play, and by the disordre of the people were broken' (Bristol, 1581); 'for mendinge the cheyre in the parlor at the Hall . . . which was broken by the playars' (Leicester, 1605); 'for mendinge the glasse wyndowes att the towne hall more then was given by the playors whoe broake the same' (Leicester, 1608); &c.

[1] Murray, ii. 205, 229, 247, 261–3, 277–81, 284–5, 377–8, &c.

[2] Ibid. 202, 224, 'Given to the Queens plaiers xix[s] iiij[d], and was to make it up xxvj[s] viij[d] that was gathered at the benche' (Bath, 1587); 'xv[s] beside the gatheringe' (Bath, 1588); 'xv[s] vj[d] besides that which was given by the companie' (Bath, 1592); 'iij[s] viij[d] on and besyde the benevolens of the people' (Canterbury, 1549); G. B. Richardson, *Extracts from the Municipal Accounts of Newcastle*, 'the Erle of Sussessx plaiers in full payment of £3 for playing a free play, commanded by M[r] Maiore' (1594).

[3] Kelly, 197, 209, 247. On 22 Nov. 1566 a Corporation 'Act agaynst Waystynge of the Towne Stock' laid down that at plays there should be no 'greate alowance' out of the stock for rewards to players, but that 'euery one of the Maiores Brethren & of the xlviij beinge requyred, or havinge sommons by the comaundement of M[r]. Maior for the tyme beinge to be there shall beare euery one of theym his & theire porcion'. This was confirmed on 4 Jan. 1570. On 16 Nov. 1582, 'It is agreed that frome henceforthe there shall not bee anye ffees or rewards gevon by the Chamber of this Towne, nor anye of the xxiiij[tl] or xlviij[tl] to be charged with anye payments ffor or towards anye Bearewards, Beearbaytings, Players, Playes, Enterludes or Games, or anye of theym except the Quenes Maiesties or the Lords of the Privye Counsall, nor that anye Players bee suffred to playe att the Towne Hall (except before except) & then butt onlye before the Mayor & his bretherne, vppon peyne of xl[s] to be lost by the Mayor that shall suffer or doe to the contrarye, to be levyed by his successour, vpon peyne of v[ll] if he make default therein'. On 30 Jan. 1607, 'It is

A Bridgnorth order of 1570 that no charge should be put upon the town fund appears to be exceptional at this date, and did not prove permanent.[1] The 'rewards' entered in the accounts are generally round sums; where they are broken, they probably went to make up the results of the 'gatherings' to round sums. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign the amounts often do not exceed a few shillings, but a general tendency to increase is apparent throughout the next half-century, and by 1616 rewards of £2 and even £3 are not uncommon. The establishment of the Queen's men in 1583 led to a rise in the rate of reward for that company, which in course of time brought about increased generosity to others.[2] The highest sums I have noted were £4 to the Queen's men at Ipswich in 1599, and to various companies at Coventry from 1612 onwards. Nottingham distinguished itself by economy, and did not go beyond 20*s.* at the best. In most places the rates fluctuate considerably to the end; being determined partly by the importance of the 'lord' and his relations to the town, partly in all probability by the opinion of the stage held by the mayor or the town, partly, one may hope, by the merits of individual plays and their interpreters. Commonly enough, the mayor's play took place in the guild-hall, in spite of the criticisms of those who, whatever their real motives, alleged the damage done and the interruption to municipal business.[3] For subsequent

agreed that non of either of the Twoe Companies shalbee compelled at anie tyme hereafter to paye towards anie playes, but such of them as shalbee then present at the said playes: the Kings Maiesties playors, the Queenes Maiesties playors, and the young Prince his playors excepted; and alsoe all such playors as doe belonge to anie of the Lords of his Maiesties most honorable Privie Counsell alsoe excepted; to theise they are to paye accordinge to the auncyent custome, havinge warnynge by the Mace bearer to bee att euerye such play'.

[1] Murray, ii. 206, 'Order by the bailiffes and 24 aldermen, as also by the comburgesses, that no playars or berwardes shalbe receved upon the Townes chardges, but if any will see the same plaies or bere baytinges, the same must be upon there owne costes and chardges'.

[2] When performances were prohibited at Chester in 1596 the city fixed the scale of 'gratuity' at 20*s.* for the Queen's players and 6*s.* 8*d.* for noblemen's players (Morris, 333). The Queen's men were 'much discontented' with 6*s.* at Dunwich in 1596–7 (*Hist. MSS., Various Collections*, vii. 82).

[3] 'Forasmuch as the grauntinge of leave to stage players or players of interludes and the like, to act and represent theire interludes playes and shewes in the towne-hall is very hurtfull troublesome and inconvenyent for that the table, benches and fourmes theire sett and placed for holdinge the Kinges Courtes are by those meanes broken and spoyled, or at least wise soe disordered that the Mayor and bayliffes and other officers of the saide courts comminge thither for the administracion of justice, especially in the Pipowder Courts of the said Towne, which are there to bee holden

performances other quarters had often to be found. These were ordinarily in an inn;[1] occasionally in the church itself or the churchyard.[2] Great Yarmouth had its specially provided 'game house'; a theatre contemplated at York in 1608–9 was to have its own company, as 'a means to restrayne the frequent comminge of other stage players', but the scheme was never actually carried out.[3]

To some extent the evidence of the accounts can be eked out by that of other records throwing a more direct light upon the responsibilities assumed by the civic authorities in regard to plays. Singularly interesting is the register of the Mayor's Court at Norwich, in which are recorded the attendances of players on their arrival in the town to submit their credentials and obtain leave for their performances.[4] The patent companies produced their letters patent in original or in exemplification, in addition to which the Court seems to have expected some instrument of deputation, if none of the men actually

twice a day yf occasion soe require, cannot sit there in such decent and convenient order as becometh, and dyvers other inconvenyences do thereupon ensue, It is therefore ordered by generall consent that from henceforth no leaue shall bee graunted to any Stage players or interlude players or to any other person or persons resortinge to this towne to act shewe or represent any manner of interludes or playes or any other sportes or pastymes whatsoeuer in the said hall' (Southampton, 1623); 'Forasmuch as we finde the glass windows in the Council Chamber to be much broken, and the city thereby suffereth much damage, ordered that no plaies nor players be suffered to have any use thereof' (Worcester, 1627). An earlier Worcester order had limited players to 'the lower end onlie' of the guildhall. At Chester in 1615 the exclusion of players from the hall was openly based on 'the common brute & scandall' due to 'convertinge the same beinge appointed & ordained for the judicial hearinge & determininge of criminall offences, & for the solempne meetinge & concourse of this howse into a stage for plaiers & a receptacle for idle persons'.

[1] 'At the New Ynn' (Abingdon, 1559); 'Certen playars, playinge uppon ropes at the Crosse Keys' (Leicester, 1590). Worcester's men played at Norwich in 1583 'in their hoste his hows', and the Queen's men in the same year at the Red Lion. A Norwich order of 1601 forbade plays at the White Horse in Tombland. A Salisbury order of 1624 laid down that all plays should in future be at the George in High Street. Where the house of a named citizen is given as the play-place, one may perhaps generally infer an inn; but in 1573 Leicester's men seem to have played at Bristol 'in the Mayors house', and at Plymouth in 1559–60 'players of London' performed 'in the vycarage'.

[2] 'In the churche' (Doncaster, 1574); 'in the colledge churche yarde' (Gloucester, 1589–90); 'in the churche lofte' (Marlow, 1608–9); 'in the churche' (Plymouth, 1559–60, 1565–6, 1573–4); 'in XXe churche' (Norwich, 1589–90); 'the Chappell nere the Newhall' (Norwich, 1616); 'because they should not play in the church' (Syston, 1602). On the religious opposition to this practice, cf. *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 191.

[3] M. Sellers, in *E. H. R.* xii. 446, from *Corporation Minute Book*, xxxiii, f. 187.

[4] Murray, ii. 335

named in the document were present.[1] The nature of the evidence forthcoming from other companies is not so clearly specified, but no doubt it consisted of the warrant of appointment by their lord, and after 1581 of the confirmatory licence from the Master of the Revels. Worcester's men were in a difficulty at Leicester in 1583 because, although they could produce the warrant from their lord, their licence from the Master had been purloined by another company.[2] It was probably as a quite special privilege that, when Strange's and Sussex's men travelled in 1593, they carried with them letters of assistance from the Privy Council itself. It may be gathered from the terms of the Norwich entries that the Court regarded its own permission or 'licence' as essential before players were entitled to set up their 'bills' or give their performances within its jurisdiction. The lord's warrant might protect his servants from the penalties of vagabondage; but it was not necessarily accepted, in the provinces any more than in London, as overriding the traditional right of the municipal governments to control the entertainments which might have serious results both upon the morality and the order of their areas. On the other hand, even if the plays had been less popular than they were, the livery of the Queen or of a powerful noble was not a thing to be lightly flouted. Perhaps the difficulty was solved by taking the warrant at its face value as a courteous letter of recommendation, and letting the licence to play and the 'reward' stand as return courtesies from the corporation to their very good lord. This fiction, however, can hardly have been applicable to the terms in which the Master of the Revels may be supposed to have worded his licence, and still less to those of the royal patents, which claimed to give direct authority to play 'within anie town halls or moute halls or other conveniente places within the liberties and freedoms of any cittie, vniversitie, towne or boroughe whatsoever within our realmes and domynions'. The corporations were not very likely to act upon the advice attributed to the Lord Coke in 1606 that such licences from the Crown were *ultra vires*.[3] No doubt they remained the arbiters as to what places were 'conveniente'. They also prescribed times and seasons, forbidding plays at their

[1] Cf. ch. xii (Chapel).

[2] So, too, the Norwich accounts record in 1590 a reward to 'the lorde Shandos players' and 'Item more in rewarde to another company of his men that cam with lycens presently after saying that thos that cam before were counterfete and not the L. Shandos men'

[3] Cf. ch. ix.

discretion on Sunday[1] or at night,[2] or in Lent,[3] or during divine service,[4] and laying down for each company the number of days during which it was at liberty to perform, or the interval which must elapse between one visit and the next. At Norwich the number of days ranged from one to eight, sometimes one performance and sometimes two being allowed on each day. The royal signet warrants which came into use about 1616 authorized the companies holding them to stay fourteen days in any one town. Sometimes Dogberry and Verges found good reason for refusing leave to play. It was a season of plague or of social disturbance in the town.[5] In

[1] 'There shall not any playes . . . be played . . . on any Sabaothe dayes nor aboue twoe daies together at any tyme. And no players . . . to be suffered to playe againe . . . within twentie and eighte daies nexte after such tyme as they shall haue laste played. . . . And they shall not exceede the hower of nyne of the clocke in the nighte' (Canterbury, *Burghmote Book*, 1595); 'This day lycens ys graunted to the L. of Huntington his players to playe one daye & not vppon the Saboath daye' (Norwich, 1597); 'The Quenes players had leave guiven them to play for one weeke so that they play neither on the Saboth day nor in the night nor more then one play a day' (Norwich, 1611).

[2] 'Not . . . after nyne of the clocke' (Norwich, 1599); cf. Canterbury, above. A Chester order of 1615 fixed 6 p.m. and a Salisbury order of 1623 7 p.m. as the limit; an Exeter order of 1609 (*H. M. C. Exeter MSS.* 321) allowed 6 p.m. between Annunciation and Michaelmas and 5 p.m. between Michaelmas and Annunciation.

[3] Lord Coke, as Recorder of Coventry, wrote to the Corporation on 28 March 1615 (Murray, ii. 254): 'Forasmuch as this time is by his Maiesties lawes and iniunctions consecrated to the service of Almighty God, and publique notice was given on the last Sabaoth for preparacion to the receyving of the holy communion. Theis are to will and require you to suffer no common players whatsoever to play within your Citie for that it would tend to the hinderance of devotion, and drawing of the artificers and common people from their labour. And this being signified vnto any such they will rest therewith (as becometh them) satisfied, otherwise suffer you them not and this shall be your sufficient warrant.' The letter is endorsed 'The Lord Coke his lettre concerning the La: Eliza: Players'. The Earl of Cumberland would not let Lord Vaux's men play in 1609 'because it was Lent & therefor not fitting' (Murray, ii. 255).

[4] Murray, ii. 234 (Chester, 1595). The Privy Council warrant for the provincial tour of Strange's men in 1593 expressly excludes plays in service time.

[5] 'The tyme was busy, they dyd not play' (Bristol, 1541); 'for that they should not playe here by reason that the sicknes was then in this Cytye' (Canterbury, 1608); 'for that the tyme was not conveynyent' (Leicester, 1584); 'to avoyd the meetynge of people this whote whether for fear of any infeccon as also for that they came fro an infected place' (Norwich, 1583). On 6 May 1597 the Privy Council wrote to the Suffolk justices to prohibit stage plays during the Whitsun holidays at Hadleigh (App. D, No. cviii), 'doubting what inconveniences may follow thereon, especially at this tyme of scarcety, when disordred people of the comon sort wilbe apt to misdemeane themselves'. There had been tumults in Norfolk during April, owing to the scarcity of grain (Dasent, xxvii. 88). The

1603 when the Admiral's men visited Canterbury, 'it was thought fit they should not play at all in regard that our late Queen was then ether very sick or dead as they supposed'. Or even if the public playing was allowed, the corporation might be too busy for a Mayor's play to be appropriate. In either event the players generally got their fee all the same, and the Chamberlain, if punctilious, entered it not as a 'reward' but as a 'gratuity', and noted in his book that the company 'did not playe'.[1] Certain indications show themselves here and there that the Puritan controversy had spread to the provinces, and even that the desire to have done with plays altogether was not wholly confined to London. As early as 1590 there was a dispute in the corporation of Maldon between an ex-bailiff of the town and certain colleagues whom he abused as 'a sort of precisians and Brownists' because they forbade a performance on a Sunday evening.[2] In 1596 the Chester corporation made an order for the suppression of plays, and fixed a 'gratuity' of 20*s.* for the Queen's men, and 6*s.* 8*d.* for those of any noble. But it does not seem that the resolution was persisted in, and in 1615 the city was still suffering from 'the common brute and scandal' of 'obscene and unlawfull plaies or tragedies', and did no more than bar them out from the Common Hall and confine them to the day-time.[3] At Hull too fines were enacted against citizens resorting to plays and landlords harbouring them in 1598.[4] The players did not always prove conformable to municipal discipline. Several cases are recorded at Norwich, in which companies played contrary to orders, and were punished by committal to prison, or by threats that their lord should be certified of their contempt, and that they should never more

Privy Council did not, however, often interfere directly with provincial plays; another example is the letter of 23 June 1592 to the Earl of Derby (cf. App. D, No. xci), forbidding plays on Sundays and holidays in his lieutenancy.

[1] I think there is a clear distinction in municipal accounts between a 'reward' for playing and a 'gratuity' for not playing; cf. the Norwich orders in Murray, ii. 339, 341, 'beinge demaunded wherefore their comeing was, sayd they came not to ask leaue to play but to aske the gratuetie of the Cytty' (1614), 'he was desired to desist from playing & offered a benevolence in money which he refused to accept' (1616), 'this house offered him a gratuitie to desist' (1616).

[2] A. Clark, *Shirburn Ballads*, 48. He complained that 'Before tyme noble-mens menn hadd such entertaynement when they came to the towne that the towne hadd the favour of noble-men, but now noble-mens menn hadd such entertaynement that the towne was brought into contempt with noble-menn'. The players were probably Essex's men, as their performance on Sunday was contrary to his 'lettre'. He was, however, also High Steward of Maldon.

[3] Cf. p. 336.

[4] T. Gent, *Hist. of Hull*, 128.

have reward of the city.[1] One of the mutinous companies in 1583 was Worcester's, who in the following year repeated their offence at Leicester, going 'with their drum and trumppytts thorowe the towne in contempt of Mr. Mayor' and using 'evyll and contemptyous words' of that dignitary, who had given them an angel (3*s.* 4*d.*) towards their dinner. The threat of reporting them to their lord reduced them to submission, and after all they were allowed to play, and made a public apology to Mr. Mayor as a prologue.

The worst of travelling was that, after all the tramping of bad roads, and all the wrangling with jacks-in-office, there was but a scanty living to be made out of it, even with the aid of the few shillings to be picked up in the larger villages, from such a windfall as is described in *Ratseis Ghost*,[2] or from the generous hospitality of a friendly manor.[3] The competition

[1] Murray, ii. 337, 'This day John Mufford one of the L[d] Beauchamps players being forbidden by M[r] Maiour to playe within the liberties of this Citie and in respect thereof gave them among them xx[s] and yett notwithstanding they did sett up bills to provoke men to come to their playe and did playe in XXe churche. Therefore the seid John Mufford is comytted to prison' (1590); cf. ch. xiii (Worcester's, 1583; Essex's, 1585; Derby's, 1602). So, too, at Coventry in 1600 'the lo: Shandoes [Chandos's] players were comitted to prison for their contempt agaynst M[r] Maior & ther remayned untill they made their submisshon under their hands as appeareth in the fyle of Record and their hands to be seene'. At Nottingham in 1603 a penalty on the host is recorded in the entry 'Richard Jackson commytted for sufferinge players to sound thyere trumpetts and playinge in his howse without lycence, and for suffering his guests to be out all night'.

[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, i. 326, reprints from this tract (S. R. 31 May 1605) the chapter 'a pretty Prancke passed by Ratsey upon certain Players that he met by chance in an Inne, who denied their Lord and Maister, and used another Noblemans name'. Gamaliel Ratsey, highwayman, harangued the players, like Hamlet, on 'striving to over-doe, and go beyond yourselves . . . yet your poets take great paines to make your parts fit for your mouthes, though you gape never so wide', and on the ups and downs of the profession, for some 'goe home at night with fifteene pence share apeece', while others become wealthy. Later he met them again passing 'like camelions' under the name of another lord. They gave a 'private play' before Ratsey, who rewarded them with 40*s.*, 'with which they held themselves very richly satisfied, for they scarce had twentie shillings audience at any time for a play in the countrey'. Next day he met them with their wagon in the highway, robbed them, bade them pawn their apparel, 'for as good actors and stalkers as you are have done it, though now they scorne it', gave them leave to play under his protection and share with him, and advised their leader to get to London.

[3] Payments to travelling companies appear in the household accounts of the Earl of Rutland at Belvoir (*Rutland MSS.* iv. 260), the Earl of Cumberland at Skipton Castle (Murray, ii. 255), the Duchess of Suffolk at Grimsthorpe (*Ancaster MSS.* 459), Sir George Vernon at Haddon Hall (G. Le B. Smith, *Haddon*, 121), Lord North at Kirtling (Murray, ii. 295), the Earl of Derby at Lathom House, New Park, and Knowsley Hall

was considerable, for in the provinces the London companies found rivals in the shape of other companies which rarely or never came to London at all, but were none the less substantial and permanent organizations. Thus Queen Elizabeth's men travelled for years between their last London appearance in 1594 and the end of the reign, and continued all the time to secure the exceptionally high rates of 'reward' which were due to the royal name. Other famous provincial companies, each of which can be traced through a period of years, were those of the Duchess of Suffolk (1548–63), and the Lords Mountjoy (1564–78), Stafford (1574–1604), Sheffield (1577–86), Berkeley (1578–1610), Chandos (1578–1610), Morley (1581–1602), Darcy (1591–1603), Mounteagle (1593–1616), Huntingdon (1597–1606), Evers (1600–13), and Dudley (1600–36). Some of these had a comparatively limited range; others covered the whole country. Their presence in the field, and that of many minor companies, must have made it difficult for the Londoners.[1] The charge of travelling, again, as Strange's men complained to the Privy Council about 1592, was intolerable, and the necessity for dividing the larger companies, so as to cover more ground, led to disorganization. Pembroke's men, when they travelled in 1593, could not save their charges, and had to pawn their apparel and return home. The years of plague and travellings were the lean years which sent the books of plays into the hands of the publishers.[2] And for a company to part with the books and garments that formed its stock in trade was a confession of failure.

The wanderings of English actors were by no means confined to England itself. They crossed the border to Scotland, where towards the end of the sixteenth century they incurred the hostility of the Kirk Sessions, which did not prevent James I from appointing one or more of them as Court comedians, and bringing them back with him in 1603 to figure in the lists of the patented royal companies.[3] Somewhat later they braved the Irish Channel, and are found at Youghal.[4] And on the

(Murray, ii. 296), the Shuttleworths at Smithills and Gawthorpe Hall (Murray, ii. 393), and Francis Willoughby at Wollaton (*Middleton MSS.* 421). In *A Mad World, my Masters*, v. 1, 2, characters shamming to be Lord Owemuch's players come to Sir Bounteous Progress's, and perform *The Slip*, until they are interrupted by a constable.

[1] Murray, ii. 19–98, records, in addition to the above, the names of from fifty to sixty patrons between 1559 and 1616, under whose names companies are not traceable in London.

[2] Cf. ch. xxii.

[3] Cf. ch. xiii (King's, Anne's).

[4] Grosart, *Lismore Papers*, 1. xix; W. J. Lawrence, *Was Shakespeare ever in Ireland?* (*Sh.-Jahrbuch*, xlii. 65). The earliest notice is of Prince Charles's men in Feb. 1616.

Continent they ranged far and wide.[1] Notices of them in France, indeed, are rarer than might be expected, perhaps because of the barrier of religion, perhaps because the Italians had already occupied the ground, perhaps only because the archives have not been thoroughly searched. To Italy and to Spain they just penetrated. In northern Europe, on the other hand, in the Netherlands, in Germany, even in Denmark, Sweden, and Poland, they found a constant welcome, until their movements were checked by the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in 1620. A pioneer company, which made its way from Leicester's head-quarters at Utrecht to the Courts of Copenhagen and Dresden in 1586, included members who afterwards became fellows of Shakespeare as Lord Chamberlain's men. The shifting relations of the numerous bands which followed them are beyond research, but the initiative in organizing the raids seems to have been largely taken by two men. One of these was Robert Browne, who paid not less than five visits abroad between 1590 and 1620, and appears to have had many associates, of whom the most important was John Green. The other was John Spencer, who first appears in 1604, and whose operations were probably quite independent of Browne's. The industry of German scholars has made it possible to trace in outline the stories of Spencer and of a group of companies owing their origin more or less directly to Browne. Their adventures were clearly much facilitated by the existence of numerous petty German courts, under cultivated rulers who were glad to take a troop of actors into their service for a year or two at a time, and then let them go for a while on their travels from one to another of the great towns. Conspicuous amongst such patrons were the Electors Joachim Frederick (1598–1608) and John Sigismund (1608–91) of Brandenburg, the Electors Christian I (1586–91), Christian II (1591–1611), and John George (1611–56) of Saxony, Henry Julius (1589–1613) Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, and Maurice (1592–1627) Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel. Naturally, also, the actors made their way to Heidelberg, whither the Elector Palatine Frederick V brought his English bride in 1613. These were Protestant princes, but Catholic Germany, although less often visited, was not closed to the English, who found particular favour with the house of the Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, afterwards the Emperor Ferdinand II. Of the great cities of Germany the most hospitable to actors, so far as our knowledge goes, were Cologne, Strassburg, Ulm, Augsburg, Nuremberg,

[1] Cf. ch. xiv.

and above all Frankfort, where the two great marts or fairs held annually at Easter and in the autumn served as a rallying-point for travellers and entertainers of every species. The early successes of the English in Germany are reported by Fynes Moryson, who was at Frankfort for the autumn fair of 1592:

'Germany hath some fewe wandring Comeydians, more deseruing pitty then prayse, for the serious parts are dully penned, and worse acted, and the mirth they make is ridiculous, and nothing lesse then witty (as I formerly haue shewed). So as I remember that when some of our cast dispised stage players came out of England into Germany, and played at Franckford in the tyme of the Mart, hauing nether a complete number of Actours, nor any good Apparell, nor any ornament of the Stage, yet the Germans, not vnderstanding a worde they sayde, both men and women, flocked wonderfully to see theire gesture and Action, rather then heare them, speaking English which they vnderstoode not, and pronowncing peeces and patches of English playes, which my selfe and some English men there present could not heare without great wearysomenes. Yea my selfe comming from Franckford in the company of some cheefe marchants Dutch and Flemish, heard them often bragg of the good markett they had made, only condoling that they had not the leasure to heare the English players.'

In the Netherlands the English players, according to Moryson, brought themselves into a singular difficulty. Here, too, was no native stage:

'For Commedians, they litle practise that Arte, and are the poorest Actours that can be imagined, as my selfe did see when the Citty of Getrudenberg being taken by them from the Spanyards, they made bonsfyers and publikely at Leyden represented that action in a play, so rudely as the poore Artizans of England would haue both penned and acted it much better. So as at the same tyme when some cast players of England came into those partes, the people not vnderstanding what they sayd, only for theere action followed them with wonderfull concourse, yea many young virgines fell in loue with some of the players, and followed them from citty to citty, till the magistrates were forced to forbid them to play any more.'[1]

Moryson's account finds confirmation in the praise lavished upon English acting by German writers, such as Erhard Cellius in 1605, Joannes Rhenanus about 1610, and Daniel von Wensin in 1613.[2] Undoubtedly the German stage, which had been

[1] C. Hughes, *Shakespeare's Europe*, 304, 373. Moryson again refers to the vogue abroad of 'stragling broken companyes' from England in his account of the London theatre; cf. ch. xvi, introduction.

[2] E. Cellius, *Eques Auratus Anglo-Wirtembergicus* (1605), 229 'Profert enim multos et praestantes Anglia musicos, comoedos, tragoedos, histrionicae peritissimos, e quibus interdum aliquot consociati sedibus suis ad

slow to develop on professional lines, owed a great impetus to the invasions. Germans attached themselves to the English companies, and in course of time imitated the English methods in companies of their own. The English plays served as models for German dramatists, of whom Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick and Jacob Ayrer of Nuremberg were the best known.[1] On the other hand, the invaders themselves became denizened, at any rate to the extent of learning to give their performances in the German tongue. Moryson found Browne's company handicapped by their use of English at Frankfort in 1592. A Münster chronicler tells us that an anonymous company which visited his town in 1601 still played 'in ihrer engelschen Sprache', but that between the acts the clown amused the audience with 'bötze und geckerie' in German.[2] In 1605 actors who petition for leave to appear at the Frankfort fair advertise their intention to give their comedies and tragedies 'in hochteutscher sprache', and there can be little doubt that, whatever may have been the case in Anglomaniac courts, theirs was the practice which ultimately prevailed in the cities.[3] Such portions of the repertories of the English actors as have been preserved are without exception in German. They are of singularly little literary value, fully bearing out Moryson's description of them as no more than 'peeces and patches' of English plays. But occasionally one of them possesses a critical interest as representing a play now lost or some earlier version of its model than that extant

tempus relictis ad exteras nationes excurrere, artemque suam illis praesertim Principum aulis demonstrare ostentareque consueverunt. Paucis ab hinc annis in Germaniam nostram Anglicani musici dictum ob finem expaciati, et in magnorum Principum aulis aliquandiu versati, tantum ex arte musica, histrionicaque sibi favorem conciliarunt, ut largiter remunerati domum inde auro et argento onusti sunt reversi'; Johannes Rhenanus, in dedication of *Streit der Sinne* (a translation of the English play of *Lingua*) to Maurice of Hesse-Cassel, '. . . die Engländischen Comoedianten (ich rede von geübten) anderen vorgehn und den Vorzug haben'; Daniel von Wensin, *Oratio contra Britanniam*, in Fr. Achillis Ducis Würtemberg, *Consultatio de principatu inter provincias Europae habita Tubingae in illustri collegio* (1613), 'Nec diu est cum plerique artifices in Anglia peregrini et exteri et aurifabri Londini pene omnes fuerunt Germani: Anglis interea gulae voluptatibus . . . et rebus nihili, atque adeo histrioniae iugiter operam dantibus; in qua sic profecerunt, ut iam apud nos Angli histriones omnium maxime delectent'.

[1] Another example is Ioannes Valentinus Andreae, who writes in his *Vita* (ed. 1849), 10 'Iam a secundo et tertio post millesimum sexcentesimum coeperam aliquid exercendi ingenii ergo pangere, cuius facile prima fuere Esther et Hyacinthus comoediae ad aemulationem Anglicorum histrionum iuvenili ausu factae'.

[2] M. Röchell, *Chronik*, in *Die Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Münster*, iii. 174.

[3] E. Mentzel, *Geschichte der Schauspielkunst in Frankfurt*, 52.

in an English text. In addition to actual plays, enough lists of performances are upon record to give a fair notion of the range of the travelling repertories. Both recent productions of the London stage and more old-fashioned pieces were drawn upon for adaptation. The choice was doubtless determined by the availability of prompter's copies or printed texts, as the case might be, when a company was collecting a stock-in-trade for its adventure. Sometimes variety was obtained by using the experiments of a German dramatist, or one of those scriptural cõmedies, *Susanna and the Elders*, *The Prodigal Son*, *Dives and Lazarus*, which had been the delight of the German, even more than the English, Renaissance.

The most obvious thing about the life of the English actor on the road in Germany is that it was uncommonly like his life on the road in England. Perhaps this is hardly surprising when it is borne in mind that, as already pointed out, the player away from his permanent theatre reverted to the status of the minstrel, and that throughout the ages the minstrel had been cosmopolitan. That in a land of alien speech, even more than at home, the strict arts of comedy and tragedy had to be eked out with music and buffoonery and acrobatics goes without saying. Even as late as 1614 and at the court of Berlin the terms on which actors were engaged bound them to render service 'mit Springen, Spielen und anderer Kurzweil', as their lord might require.[1] Away from court, in Germany as in England, they were mainly dependent upon the goodwill of the civic magistrates, to whom on approaching each town they addressed elaborate petitions, of which many are preserved, in which they recited their own merits, and made play with the names of any princes whose servants they were entitled to call themselves, or whose recommendation some successful display had enabled them to gain. There was always the chance that, on the strength of plague or some other pretext, they might be refused admission altogether. At the best, they must expect to have the length of their stay, the days and hours of their performances, the sums they might charge for standing-room and seats, most thoughtfully and minutely regulated for them. And when all the preliminaries were gone through, and the Rathaus or an inn-yard put at their disposal, and the creaking boards set up, and the tattered frippery extracted from the hamper, it might perhaps after all, as at Brunswick in 1614, be a case of 'kein Volk' and the Council might give them a thaler out of charity and send them on their way.[2] In Germany too, as in England, they had to

[1] Cohn, lxxxviii.

[2] A. Glaser, *Geschichte des Theaters in Braunschweig*, 13.

make their account with the wise, to whom their performances were folly, and the 'unco' guid', to whom they were an offence.[1] Evidently they were not always discreet in their choice of themes. At Elbing in 1605 a company received a gratification of twenty thalers for a performance before the Council; and the record continues, '. . . daneben aber auch ihnen zu untersagen, dass sie nunmehr zu agiren aufhören sollen in Anmerkung, dass sie gestern in der Comödie schandbare Sachen fürgebracht.[2] Even princes sometimes got into trouble by encouraging these foreigners of doubtful respectability. There was glee in Cassel when Landgrave Maurice decided to disband the 'verfluchten' English in 1602. Possibly in this case it was the taxpayer rather than the Puritan who felt relief; but when the Duke of Pommern-Wolgast and his mother allowed the Schlosskirche at Lötz to be used for a performance in 1606 they brought upon themselves a shower of letters from Hofprediger Gregorius Hagius, which precisely re-echo the familiar English diatribes of Stephen Gosson and John Rainolds.[3] Presumably the whole business paid its way, or Browne would not have gone over four or five times or Spencer spent fifteen years in the country. A recent investigator, who has made a far more elaborate analysis of all the financial material than I have room for, calculates that, what with court salaries, and what with admission fees to public performances at the rate of about three kreuzers or less than a penny a head, an actor might hope to make on the average about £60 a year.[4] This was enough to live upon, even if, as was sometimes the case, wife and children accompanied the expedition. It seemed attractive enough to poor Richard Jones, who was making at home 'some tymes a shillinge a day and some tymes nothinge'. But it hardly bears out the statement of Erhard Cellius that the English returned home 'auro et argento onusti'. And in fact those who essayed a career in Germany were the failures of London. 'Some of our cast dispised stage players', Moryson calls them, and many years later, in 1625, the same tale is told by the words put into the mouths of actors in

[1] *Archiv für Litteratur-Geschichte*, xv. 212, from diary of Martin Crusius at Tübingen in 1597: 'Es sind wol x Comoedianten hie gewesen: qui 5 aut 6 dies comoedias egerunt in domo frumentaria. Dicuntur Angli esse et miri artifices. Sunt illi quibus Dux noster 300 fl. donasse dicitur. Ego non spectaui. Quid ad hominem ista septuagenario maiorem? fuerunt illa dramata amatoria. Hodie Susannam egerunt. Ego sum scriptoribus Homericis occupatus.'

[2] Cohn, lxxx.

[3] C. F. Meyer in *Sh.-Jahrbuch*, xxxviii. 200.

[4] C. Harris in *M. L. A.* xxii. 446.

The Run-away's Answer : ' We can be bankrupts on this side and gentlemen of a company beyond the sea : we burst at London, and are pieced up at Rotterdam.' [1] There were, indeed, those who made their fortunes abroad, but they were those who, like Thomas Sackville, forsook the stage and devoted their energies to an honest trade.

[1] Cohn, xcvi.

XI

THE ACTOR'S ECONOMICS

[*Bibliographical Note.*—The material for this chapter is mainly to be found in Book III (Companies) and Book IV (Theatres) and the works there cited. My account of Henslowe is practically all based on W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary* (1904–8) and *Henslowe Papers* (1907). W. Rendle made a useful contribution in *Philip Henslowe* (*Genealogist*, n. s. iv). Since I completed this chapter, useful studies in theatrical finance have been contributed by A. Thaler, *Shakespeare's Income* (1918, *S. P.* xv. 82), *Playwright's Benefits and Interior Gathering in the Elizabethan Theatre* (1919, *S. P.* xvi. 187), *The Elizabethan Dramatic Companies* (1920, *M. L. R.* xxxv. 123).]

WITHAL the actors, or the more discreet of them, prospered. This fact peeps out from the diatribes of their critics, and is indeed part of the case against them. The theatres are thronged, while the churches are empty. The drones suck the honey stored up by London's laborious citizens. Already, in 1578, John Stockwood estimates the aggregate gain of eight play-houses, open but once in the week, at £2,000 by the year. The players began to ruffle it, in garments fit only for their betters. 'The very hyrelings', says Gosson in 1579, 'which stand at reuersion of vi^{s} by the weeke, iet under gentlemen's noses in sutes of silke, exercising themselues too prating on the stage, and common scoffing when they come abrode, where they looke askance ouer the shoulder at euery man, of whom the Sunday before they begged an almes'; and in like vein Walsingham's correspondent of 1587 bewails to him the 'wofull sight to see two hundred proude players jett in their silkes, wheare five hundred pore people starve in the streets'. It is, however, possible to lay undue stress upon the public finery as an evidence of prosperity, for this was apt to be borrowed from the tiring-house wardrobe, and in time it was found that the advertisement earned hardly justified the detriment to the common stock of apparel. The articles signed by those joining the Lady Elizabeth's men about 1614 bound them amongst other things not to go out of the theatre with any of the apparel on their bodies. The surest economic sign of a growing industry is the capacity to spend money on building, and it was a true instinct that led Stockwood to discommend the gorgeous playing-places erected at 'great charges' in the fields, and

William Harrison to note it as 'an evident token of a wicked time when plaiers wexe so riche that they can build suche houses'. And when Robert Greene wanted to paint a picture of a typical successful actor in 1592, he made him describe himself as one who had once travelled on foot and carried his properties on his back, but now his very share in playing apparel would not be sold for £200, and he was reputed by his neighbours able 'at his proper cost to build a windmill'.[1] James Burbadge was 'the first builder of playhowses', and thereby laid the foundations of the prosperity of his family. He had been a joiner, before he became a player, and perhaps this suggested the enterprise of the Theatre, which he put up in 1576 upon borrowed capital. When his son Richard died in 1619 he was reckoned worth £300 a year in land. Even more fortunate was Edward Alleyn, who was in a position to retire from the stage before he was forty, to purchase the manor of Dulwich for £10,000, to build the College of God's Gift, and thereafter to spend upon the maintenance of his household and his foundation at the rate of some £1,700 a year. Other actors, mainly of the King's company, can be shown to have made their more modest piles. Thomas Pope, Augustine Phillips, Henry Condell, all appear from their wills to have been substantial men when they died. John Heminge is described in 1614 as 'of greate lyveinge wealth and power'. The Restoration story that Shakespeare spent £1,000 a year at Stratford is probably apocryphal, in view of the fact that his known investments only amount to a little over £1,000; but at least he returned as a moneyed man to the scene of his father's bankruptcy, and enjoyed consideration as the owner of the best house in his native town. Aubrey's statement that he left property worth about £200 or £300 a year, which gives him a fortune about equal to Richard Burbadge's, seems not unreasonable.[2] Like true Englishmen, the successful players sought after less material proof of their worth than was afforded by their lands and houses. Alleyn, having long been lord of a manor, and having connected himself by marriage with the Dean of St. Paul's, was desirous in 1624 of 'sum further dignetie', probably a knighthood. Others were content with acquiring or

[1] App. C, No. xlviii.

[2] C. Severn, *Diary of John Ward* (*c.* 1661–3), 183, 'I have heard that Mr. Shakespeare . . . in his elder days lived at Stratford: and supplied the stage with 2 plays every year, and for itt had an allowance so large, that hee spent att the rate of a 1,000*l* a year, as I have heard'; Aubrey, ii. 226, 'I thinke I have been told that he left 2 or 300 *li* per annum there and thereabout [i.e. at Stratford] to a sister'.

assuming a claim to armorial bearings, which would entitle them to rank as 'gentlemen'. Shakespeare in 1596 obtained a confirmation of a grant of arms made to his father as bailiff of Stratford nearly thirty years before; and in 1599 sought additional authority to impale the coat of his mother's family, the Ardens.[1] Heminges obtained a confirmation of arms in 1629. Such grants did not go altogether unstrictured by heraldic purists, and the cases of Shakespeare and of his fellow Richard Cowley formed part of the material for a charge of making grants to 'base and ignoble persons' brought by a rival against the responsible king-of-arms. Augustine Phillips and Thomas Pope did not trouble the heralds, but went to an heraldic painter, and bought, the one the arms of Sir William Phillips, Lord Bardolph, and the other those of Sir Thomas Pope, Chancellor of the Augmentations.[2] These ambitions of the players, no less than their investments, yielded stuff both for moralizing and for satire. Henry Crosse, in his *Vertues Common-wealth* (1603), rebukes the pride of the 'copper-lace gentlemen' who 'purchase lands by adulterous playes'.[3] And in the tract of *Ratseis Ghost* (1605), already cited, Gamaliel Ratsey speaks of those 'whom Fortune hath so well favored that, what by penny-sparing and long practise of playing, are growne so wealthy that they have expected to be knighted, or at least to be conjunct in authority and to sit with men of great worship on the bench of justice'; and he advises the country player, with whom he has fallen in, to get him to London, 'and when thou feelest thy purse well lined, buy thee some place or lordship in the country, that, growing weary of playing, thy mony may there bring thee to dignitie and reputation'. The player too heard 'of some that have gone to London very meanly, and have come in time to be exceeding wealthy'. Ratsey then knights him 'Sir Simon Two Shares and a Halfe', and tells him he is 'the first knight that ever was player in England'.[4]

Certainly all players did not grow rich, even in London.

[1] Lee, 281; G. R. French *Shakespeareana Genealogica*, 514; *Herald and Genealogist*, i. 492.

[2] Lee, 285, citing (*a*) manuscript notes by Ralph Brooke on William Dethick's grants of arms, in which both Shakespeare and Cowley appear in a list of persons given arms on false pretences, and (*b*) a manuscript *Discourse of the Causes of Discord amongst the Officers of Arms* by William Smith, Rougedragon, 'Phillipps the player had graven in a gold ring the armes of S^r W^m Phillipp, Lord Bardolph, with the said L. Bardolphs cote quartred, which I shewed to M^r York [Brooke, York Herald] at a small gravers shopp in Foster Lane. . . . Pope the player would have no other armes but the armes of S^r Tho. Pope, Chancelor of y^e Augmentations'.

[3] App. C, No. liv.

[4] Halliwell-Phillipps, i. 325; cf. ch. x.

Some of them to the end, perhaps the majority, remained threadbare companions enough; in and out of debt, spongers upon their fellows, frequenters of pawnshops, acquainted with prison. Partly it was a matter of character. Those who had to do with the stage were not all such riff-raff as a hasty reading of the Puritan literature might suggest. Gosson, indeed, admits as much, allowing that some among those professing 'the qualitie' are 'sober, discreete, properly learned honest housholders and citizens well thought on amonge their neighbours at home'; while on his side Thomas Heywood is quick to maintain the harm wrought by the licentious to a calling in which many are 'of substance, of government, of sober lives and temperate carriages, housekeepers and contributory to all duties enjoyned them', and to plead that if there be a few of degenerate demeanour, his readers will not 'censure hardly of all for the misdeeds of some'.[1] Doubtless there is a certain instability of temperament, which the life of the theatre, with its ups and downs of fortune, its unreal sentiments and its artificially stimulated emotions, is well calculated to encourage; and we may perhaps find the victims of such a temperament in certain actors who, although clearly of standing in their profession, seem to have been constantly shifting from company to company, without attaining any secure position or, as one may conjecture, reaping any substantial harvest from their labour and their skill. One of these was Richard Jones, originally a fellow of Alleyn with Lord Worcester's men, presently selling to Alleyn his share of clothes and books, at one time reduced to 1*s.* a day or nothing, at another setting out to tour the Continent with Robert Browne, then back again with Alleyn amongst the Admiral's men, then transferring himself to the Swan and returning a few months later to the Rose, and finally allowing himself to be bought out for £50 and passing into obscurity. Another was Martin Slater, also at one time one of the Admiral's men, whom he left and went to law with, then a wanderer with Laurence Fletcher in Scotland, and afterwards successively traceable with Lord Hertford's men, with Queen Anne's, as a member of the King's Revels syndicate, and with Queen Anne's again as manager of one of the provincial companies travelling under the Queen's warrant. Perhaps it is merely another way of stating the same issue to say that the financial success of a player depended on his obtaining an interest, not merely in the day-to-day profits of a company, but also in the

[1] App. C, Nos. xxii, lvii; cf. Wright (App. I, ii) on the 'grave and sober behaviour' of the later King's men.

permanent investment represented by a theatre. This becomes readily apparent upon an analysis of the business methods employed in the organization of the dramatic industry. The basis of this organization was the banding together of players into associations or partnerships, the members of which acted together, held a common stock of garments and play-books, incurred joint expenditure, and daily or at other convenient periods divided up the profits of their enterprise. In a legal document an associate of such a company is described as 'a full adventurer, storer and sharer among them'; [1] the term in ordinary use was 'sharer'. No doubt the sharing arrangement was in origin traditional; it is described in 1614 as 'accordinge to the custome of players'.[2] But it became convenient to formulate it in a legal agreement or 'composition', which provided for the co-operation of the sharers and defined their relations to each other. Thus the composition of the Duke of York's men in 1610 bound them to play together for three years, and deprived a member who left without the consent of his fellows of any interest in the common stock. Under that of Queen Anne's men about 1612 a retiring sharer was entitled to a payment at the rate of £80 for a full share. Such provisions, which were intended to obviate the breaking up of a stock, and of themselves indicate a substantial investment of capital, seem to have been usual. Alleyn had £50 on leaving the Admiral's men in 1597, Jones and Shaw £50 in 1602; under the composition of the same company, then the Prince's men, in 1613, a sharer retiring with consent was entitled to £70. Both the Queen's and the Prince's men made a similar allowance to the widow of a sharer. Each of the sharers signed a bond for the observance of the composition, which also covered certain disciplinary regulations imposed by the company on its members. Thus the articles signed by Robert Dawes, on joining the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1614, not only made him a partaker in the contractual and financial liabilities of the company, but also exposed him to penalties if he missed plays or rehearsals, or came late or in a state of intoxication, or took apparel or other common property away from the theatre. As the compositions grew more detailed and the enterprises more important, it proved convenient that one of the sharers should be appointed, formally or informally, to act as trustee and manager for the rest, to receive and make payments, to hold the composition, bonds, licences, and other legal papers, and generally to look after the business

[1] Cf. ch. xiii (Anne's).

[2] Cf. ch. xiii (Lady Elizabeth's).

interests of his fellows. Thus it is pleaded in a lawsuit concerning Queen Anne's men that Thomas Greene was 'one of the principall and cheif persons of the said companie', and did 'laie out or disburse' moneys on their behalf; and that, after his death in 1612, the company 'did put the managing of thier whole businesses and affaires belonging vnto them ioyntly as they were players in trust' unto Christopher Beeston, by whom they were 'altogether ruled'. John Heminge seems to have acted in a similar capacity for the King's men, and to have had the custody of their deeds. He regularly appears as their payee at Court, and it is probable that he gave up acting in order to devote himself to business management. The members of a company did not invariably share and share alike. It is possible that in some cases the manager or a leading actor had a preponderant interest.[1] Tucca, in *The Poetaster*, at the end of his interview with Histrio, bids him commend him to 'Seven Shares and a Half'. So, too, Gamaliel Ratsey knights his player as 'Sir Simon Two Shares and a Halfe'. Perhaps this is only the chaff of the satirists. In any case one hopes that there is no foundation for the further suggestion of Tucca, when he offers to take the players into his service, and 'ha' two shares for my countenance'.[2] We know what Ratsey's corresponding threat to 'share with thee againe for playing under my warrant' means, for Ratsey was a highwayman, and levied his share not by 'composition', but at the end of a pistol. An actual example of a privileged share is that held by Alleyn in the Admiral's company about 1600, which

[1] Dekker and Webster, *Northward Ho!* IV. i. 1:

'*Bellamont.* Sirrah, I'll speak with none.
Servant. What? Not a player?
Bellamont. No; though a sharer bawl.
I'll speak with none, although it be the mouth
Of the big company.'

Cf. Dekker, *News from Hell* (1606, *Works*, ii. 99), 'Marrie players swarme there as they do here, whose occupation being smelt out, by the Cacodaemon, or head officer of the Countrie, to bee lucrative, he purposes to make vp a company, and to be chiefe sharer himselfe'; also *A Mad World, my Masters*, V. i. 42, where one of the sham Lord Owemuch's players is a 'politician', who 'works out restraints, makes best legs at court, and has a suit made of purpose for the company's business' and 'has greatest share and may live of himselfe'.

[2] Jonson, *Poetaster*, III. iv. 373, 'Commend me to seuen-shares and a halfe, and remember to morrow—if you lacke a seruice, you shall play in my name, rascalls, but you shall buy your owne cloth, and I'le ha' two shares for my countenance'. It appears from a list of Sir Henry Herbert's profits as Master of the Revels, drawn up in 1662, that he had secured a share, which he valued at £100 a year, from each of the London companies, other than the King's men (*Variorum*, iii. 266).

seems to have been free of any liability to contribute towards the upkeep of the stock or other current expenses.[1] The shares were often subdivided, so that some members of the company were full sharers, others half sharers or three-quarter sharers.[2] The number of shares varied; an ordinary London company may be taken to have consisted of about ten or twelve sharers.[3] For travelling purposes it is probable that separate compositions were entered into, except perhaps for short summer tours, and that the numbers were smaller.[4] It should be made clear that the companies of players, although based upon the bodies of royal or noble servants constituted under patents or other warrants of appointment, were not precisely identical with these. Each company had to get the authority of such a warrant, before it was licensed to act at all, but the legal bond of association between its members was not the warrant, but the composition. As a rule the terms of the patents give or imply a power to those named in them to associate themselves with others. New members could doubtless be sworn into the service of the lord without any need for a fresh patent. But it cannot be held that every fellow sharer was necessarily a servant of the same lord, and still less that every servant named in a warrant was necessarily a sharer of any particular company acting under that warrant. Thus there is no proof that Laurence Fletcher, who is named first amongst the King's servants of 1603, ever acted with the King's men. Similarly Martin

[1] It is impossible to say what arrangement underlies the statement in an undated letter from Richard Jones to Alleyn about a German tour (*Henslowe Papers*, 33) that Robert Browne was 'put to half a shaer, and to stay hear, for they ar all against his goinge'.

[2] *Hamlet*, III. ii. 286:

'*Hamlet.* Would not this, sir, and a forest of feathers—if the rest of my fortunes turn Turk with me—with two Provincial roses on my razed shoes, get me a fellowship in a cry of players.

Horatio. Half a share.

Hamlet. A whole one, I.'

For half-sharers, cf. ch. xiii (Queen's, Admiral's). Three-quarter sharers existed in the Lady Elizabeth's men about 1614; cf. T. M., *Father Hubburd's Tales* (Bullen, *Middleton*, viii. 64). 'The ant began to stalk like a three-quarter sharer'.

[3] The number of players named in the Jacobean patents varies from 7 to 14, but this gives little direct guidance as to the number of sharers. It is, however, consistent with my estimate, which is based mainly upon the number of Admiral's men shown at various times in contractual relations with Henslowe. There were 12 sharers in the Lady Elizabeth's company in 1611 and 12 in Queen Anne's company in 1617. Probably the Elizabethan companies ran rather smaller.

[4] Dekker, *News from Hell* (1606), 'a companie of country players, being nine in number, one sharer and the rest jornymen'; cf. p. 362.

Slater and certain other Queen's servants and Gilbert Reason, a Prince's servant, did not, during long periods, act with the corresponding London companies, but toured the provinces with companies of their own, taking out for this purpose duplicates or exemplifications of the patents, a practice which came to be regarded by the authorities as an abuse.[1] On the other hand, the servants of two lords sometimes played as a single company.[2] Thus Lord Oxford's men and Lord Worcester's were 'ioyned by agrement togeather in on companie' at the Boar's Head during 1602. Similarly Lord Hunsdon's men and Lord Howard's came as a single company to Court in 1586; the Queen's men and Lord Sussex's were 'togeather' at the Rose in 1594, while Rosseter's patent for the Porter's Hall theatre in 1615 contemplates its use by no less than three companies, the Lady Elizabeth's, the Prince's, and the Queen's Revels, probably as a united body. Or the servant of one lord might attach himself as an individual to the company passing under the name of another. Thus Alleyn was still an Admiral's man when he toured with Lord Strange's men in 1593, possibly as the last representative of a more complete combination between two companies. Similarly Robert Pallant remained a Queen's man while playing successively with the Lady Elizabeth's and the Duke of York's in 1614–16, and William Rowley appeared in the Prince's livery at King James's funeral in 1625, although he had probably joined the King's men some two years before.[3]

The sharers did not, however, take the whole risk of a theatrical enterprise; the owner or owners of the play-house stood in with them. This arrangement certainly goes back to the days of the elder Burbadge, 'the first builder of play-houses'. I do not know whether it had also prevailed in the London inn-yards. Instead of paying a fixed rent for the building placed at their disposal, the sharers assigned to the owner a fixed part of the takings at each performance. Originally Burbadge had the whole of the payments made at

[1] Cf. ch. ix.

[2] Amalgamated companies also toured the provinces, and even entered into partnership with companies, such as Lord Morley's, which were purely provincial. Thus we find Hunsdon's and Morley's at Bristol in 1583, and Hunsdon's and Howard's at Leicester in 1585; the Queen's and Sussex's at Southampton, Gloucester, and Coventry in 1590–1; the Queen's and Morley's at Aldeburgh on 11 Oct. 1592 (Stopes, *Hunnis*, 314); the Admiral's, Strange's (or Derby's), and Morley's variously combined at Ipswich, Southampton, Bath, Shrewsbury, York, and Newcastle in 1592–4. Sometimes players worked with musicians, tumblers or rope-dancers; of course this was so in London itself, but naturally the old methods of the mimes tended to reassert themselves more markedly in the provinces.

[3] Murray, i. 172 (table), 237.

the entrances to the galleries; his successors contented themselves with half these payments, together with, at the Globe, half those made at the tiring-house door. The other half, and the full payments at all other outer doors went to the sharers. The owner was apparently allowed to safeguard his interests by appointing the 'gatherers' or money-takers for the galleries.[1] When the Globe was opened in 1599 the Burbadges of the second generation hit upon the device of binding the interests of some of the leading actors more closely to their own by giving them a share in these profits of the 'house'. To this end the site was conveyed by lease in two distinct moieties. One the Burbadges held; the other was divided amongst five of the actors. Subsequently it was several times redivided into a varying number of fractions, according as one man dropped out, or it was desired to admit another to participate in the benefits. The tenures of the fractions, while such as to secure joint control, did not prevent the alienation of the profits attached to them. This gave rise to some trouble, owing to the remarriage of widows with persons who were not members of the company at all. Incidentally it enabled John Heminge and Henry Condell, who had business capacity, to buy up by degrees the whole moiety. There was a rent payable to the ground landlord, and to this each holder of a fraction made a proportionate contribution. A levy was also called when the Globe had to be rebuilt after a fire in 1613. The Burbadges claimed to have

[1] Henslowe's agreement with John Cholmley, probably for the Rose, in 1587, provides for joint appointment by the parties as landlords. The same arrangement is implied, so far as the galleries are concerned, by the Lady Elizabeth's agreement of 1614. In 1612 Robert Browne wrote to Alleyn to procure 'a gathering place' for the wife of one Rose, a hireling of Prince Henry's men. Apparently the sharers had to pay the gatherers' wages. An undated letter from William Bird, also of Prince Henry's men, to Alleyn tells him of the dishonesty of John Russell, 'that by yowr apoyntment was made a gatherer with us'. The company will not let him 'take the box', but will pay his wages as 'a nessessary atendaunt on the stage', and if he likes, employ him also as a tailor. Henslowe made the Lady Elizabeth's pay for nine gatherers more than he was entitled to. In *Frederick and Basilea*, the gatherers came on as supers (*Henslowe Papers*, 3, 24, 63, 85, 89, 137). The 'place or priviledge' in the Globe and Blackfriars left by Henry Condell to Elizabeth Wheaton in 1627 was presumably that of a gatherer. A satirist wrote in *The Actors Remonstrance* of 1643 (Hazlitt, *E. D. S.* 263), 'Our very doore-keepers men and women most grievously complaine that by this cessation they are robbed of the privilege of stealing from us with licence: they cannot now, as in King Agamemnon's dayes, seeme to scratch their heads where they itch not, and drop shillings and half croune-pieces in at their collars'. The money taken at the door or in the gallery was traditionally put in a box and kept for division; cf. Rankins, *Mirrour of Monsters* (1587), f. 6, 'door-keepers and box-holders at plays'.

been at the cost of the original building and to have raised a loan for the purpose. We know that they pulled down the Theatre and carried the materials across the water. The lease of the Globe formed a precedent for a somewhat similar transaction when the King's men took over responsibility for the Blackfriars in 1608. In this case the freehold belonged to Richard Burbadge, who leased out the play-house in sevenths, keeping one fraction himself, and allotting the rest to his brother, to the representative of a former tenant, and to four of the players. At some later date the interest was divided into eighths instead of sevenths. It is to be noted that it was only certain selected men who thus acquired rights in the profits of the houses, and one of the effects of the policy adopted was to set up a distinction amongst the members of the association itself, of whom some were both 'housekeepers', as they came to be called, and ordinary sharers, while others were ordinary sharers alone. At the Blackfriars from the beginning, and at the Globe as rights under the leases were alienated, there were also housekeepers who were not sharers at all, and might even be members of rival companies. A dispute arising from these anomalies throws light upon the responsibilities undertaken and the advantages enjoyed by housekeepers and sharers respectively. It is of late date, but there is no reason to think that the conditions revealed were substantially different from those of earlier years. About 1630 all the rights in both houses were held, mainly through deaths and alienations, by persons who were not actors. Shortly afterwards two or three of the leading members of the company were allowed to acquire interests, and in 1635 three other sharers brought the state of things before the notice of the Lord Chamberlain, who exercised some equitable control over the affairs of the company as a part of the royal Household, and petitioned that they too might be admitted to the same privilege of purchasing fractions of the leases 'at the usuall and accustomed rates'. The pleadings and the orders of the Lord Chamberlain form the record known as the *Sharers Papers*.[1] From them it emerges that the housekeepers were entitled to receive a full moiety, 'without any defalcation or abatement at all' of all takings from the galleries and boxes in both houses and from the tiring-house door of the Globe. The sharers had the other moiety, together with the takings at the outer doors. If a man was a sharer as well as a housekeeper, he claimed under both heads. The outgoings were also

[1] Cf. ch. xvi (Globe) and ch. xvii (Blackfriars); the document is printed in Halliwell-Phillipps, i. 312.

apportioned, and in the view of the sharers, most unfairly. The housekeepers only had to pay the rent and the cost of repairs. The sharers had to find hired men and boys, and to meet all charges for apparel, poets, music, lights, and so forth. The Lord Chamberlain was apparently impressed by the justice of the representation, and made an order for a transfer of interests in both houses.

The method of organization adopted by the Burbadges was subject to abuses, both from alienation and from the agglutinative tendencies of Heminge and Condell. But, at any rate during the earlier years of its working, it seems to have served its purpose of attaching the individual King's men, by means of a capital investment, to the welfare and stability of their company. It was adopted by their principal rivals, by the Queen's men at the Red Bull from the beginning of the reign, by Alleyn and the Prince's men at the Fortune from a somewhat later date. Certainly these companies rested upon a firmer foundation than those which had to look for their theatre to an outside capitalist, especially when that outside capitalist was Philip Henslowe. I have more than once had occasion to mention Henslowe, whose personality stands out, more clearly perhaps than any other, from the stage history of our whole period. It is to the labours of my friend Dr. Greg that we owe an adequate presentment of that personality. He appears to have been a younger son of a good family, originally of Devonshire, but settled in Sussex, where his father was Master of the Game in Ashdown Forest and Brill Park. He had evidently had little formal education, and was a poor man when, probably at some date in the 'seventies, he married Agnes Woodward, a wealthy widow, to whose former husband he had been 'servant'. Agnes had a daughter Joan, who in 1592 married Edward Alleyn, between whom and Henslowe, ever after if not before this event, the closest business and personal relations existed. The occupation which Henslowe thus, in the traditional manner of apprentices, acquired may have been that of a dyer; he is described in documents of about 1584–7 as 'citizen and dyer of London'. But he had a shrewd business capacity, which he turned to many other ways of making money. He was at one time engaged in the manufacture of starch. From at least 1587 onwards he was interested in theatrical property. Between 1593 and 1596 he was carrying on, through agents, a pawnbroking establishment. By 1592 at latest he had obtained an appointment as Groom of the Chamber at Court.[1] In 1603 he was pro-

[1] This is the only point on which I have anything to add to Dr. Greg's

moted to be Gentleman Sewer of the Chamber to King James. About 1594 he began to finance the Southwark bear-baiting, under a licence from the Master of the Royal Game of Paris Garden, and by arrangement with Alleyn who held the Bear Garden, and Jacob Meade who was Keeper of the Bears. After more than one unsuccessful attempt, Henslowe and Alleyn secured a transfer to themselves of the joint Mastership of Paris Garden in 1604. Meanwhile Henslowe was steadily amassing house property, most of it in Southwark, and some of it, at least by origin, of a rather questionable character.[1] His own residence is given in 1577 as in the Liberty of the Clink, more precisely in 1593 as 'on the bank sid right over against the clink', whereby is doubtless meant the prison which gave its name to the Liberty; and in the Clink he continued to dwell to the end. For subsidies he was regularly assessed at £10. He filled parochial offices, becoming

personal information as to Henslowe; it is important as bearing on the history of Lord Strange's men (q.v.). He is described as Groom of the Chamber in an undated document (*Henslowe Papers*, 42) belonging to a series dealing with the opening of the Rose for Strange's men in a long vacation. This cannot be put later than 1592, as there was plague throughout the long vacation of 1593 and Lord Strange became Earl of Derby in Sept. 1593. On the other hand, Dr. Greg (Henslowe, ii. 9; *Henslowe Papers*, 36), following Warner, 8, argues that Henslowe must have become Groom of the Chamber later than 7 April 1592, since he is not named in a list of Grooms appended to a warrant of that date and is named in a similar list of 26 Jan. 1599. These warrants are in *Addl. MS.* 5750, ff. 114, 116. They are original warrants for the 'watching liveries' which were issued annually, but on irregular dates, to the Yeomen of the Guard and to the Groom Porter and fourteen Grooms of the Chamber. A complete series of copies of these warrants is preserved in *Lord Chamberlain's Records*, v. 90, 91, and shows that Henslowe only received a watching livery during three consecutive years, on 14 Nov. 1597, 26 Jan. 1599, and 27 Oct. 1599. Yet we know that he was a Groom in Aug. 1593 from the address on one of Alleyn's letters (*Henslowe Papers*, 36), and about 1595–6 from a petition to the first Lord Hunsdon, who died in June 1596 (*Henslowe Papers*, 44). Therefore the absence of his name from the livery list of 7 April 1592 is no proof that he was not then already a Groom. Probably Henslowe was only an Extraordinary Groom, and only some of the Extraordinary Grooms were needed to supplement the twelve Ordinary ones for watching purposes.

[1] Dr. Greg (Henslowe, ii. 22, 25) shows that Henslowe almost certainly held a lease of the Barge, the Bell, and the Cock 'vppon the banke called Stewes', describes these houses as 'licensed brothels', and infers that Henslowe was 'the intermediate landlord between the stew-keepers and the Reverend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of Winchester'. It is possible that the tradition, as well as the name, of the district endured into Elizabeth's reign, but Dr. Greg forgets, in his Voltairean mood, that the system of episcopal licences terminated in the reign of Henry VIII (Rendle, *Bankside*, xi). Ultimately Alleyn secured on the property the settlement of his wife Constance, daughter of John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, which must surely have established its respectability.

vestryman of St. Saviour's, Southwark, in 1607, churchwarden in 1608, and governor of the free grammar school in 1612. His death on 6 January 1616 was followed almost immediately by that of his widow in April 1617, and most of his property passed into the hands of the Alleyns, together with a mass of papers, which are now amalgamated with Alleyn's own at Dulwich. The collection is of the first importance both for dramatic and for social history. It contains title-deeds of theatres, agreements, and bonds entered into by companies of players, private correspondence between the members of Henslowe's family and with the poets and actors dependent upon him, inventories of stage costumes, book-holder's 'plots' or outlines of plays, and many other documents touching in innumerable ways upon the finance and control of the stage. It also contains Henslowe's famous 'Diary'. This is not in fact a diary at all, but a folio memorandum book, which Henslowe used principally during 1592–1603, and in which he entered in picturesque confusion particulars of accounts between himself and the companies occupying his theatres, together with jottings on many personal and business matters, and records of loans, which are often written, signed, or witnessed in the autographs of players and poets.

From the diary and the related documents it is possible to reconstruct in its main outlines the history of Henslowe's theatrical enterprises, and to contrast his policy as a capitalist with that of his rivals, the Burbadges. During the earlier years covered by our information, the theatre with which he was mainly concerned was the Rose, which he had himself built on the Bankside, although he appears also to have had an interest in the distant and practically disused house at Newington Butts. At one or other of these he entertained a succession of companies for the short periods during which playing was possible in the plague-stricken period of 1592–4. In the autumn of 1594 he settled down with Alleyn and the Admiral's men at the Rose, and this combination lasted, with some reorganization of the company in 1597, until 1600, when the Admiral's men moved to the newly built Fortune, and were succeeded a couple of years later at the Rose by Lord Worcester's men. It seems clear from an analysis of the accounts which he kept during 1592–7, that Henslowe, like the housekeepers at the Globe, was in the practice of taking his profits as landlord in the form, not of a fixed rent, but of a share of the daily takings at the theatre, and in his case also the sum allotted seems to have been half the proceeds of the galleries as distinct from the outer doors of the play-

house. He was responsible for keeping the building in repair, and for the fees to the Master of the Revels for licensing its use; all other outgoings had presumably to be met by the company. If, as sometimes happened, the theatre was put at the disposal of some fencer or other performer not belonging to the company, the profits of the subletting were apportioned between Henslowe and the actors.[1] It should be added that, under an agreement entered into when the building of the Rose was being planned in 1587, Henslowe had assigned half his profits for a term of eight years and a quarter to one John Cholmley in return for fixed quarterly payments. The covenants of the agreement entitled the parties jointly to appoint actors to perform in the play-house, and gatherers to collect the entrance fees, and reserved to each of them the right 'to suffer theire frendes to go in for nothinge'. They were to share the cost of repairs and Cholmley, who was a grocer, was to have the monopoly of selling drink on the premises. The agreement was probably terminated by Cholmley's death; if not, it would have served Henslowe for an insurance over the lean years of the long plague.[2]

The character of Henslowe's entries in the diary changes towards the end of 1597, but the indications do not suggest any alteration in the conditions upon which the Admiral's men remained his tenants. On the other hand, the new series of accounts reveals certain relations between himself and the company for which there is no known analogy in the organization of the King's men. Quite apart from payments for the use of the theatres, the players had to meet divers costs of maintenance, including the purchase of play-books from dramatists and the provision of properties and garments for new productions. These charges were heavy and fluctuating, and proved a difficulty for men who lived from hand to mouth, and had acquired the thriftless habit of sharing their takings weekly or even daily, and keeping no reserve fund. Henslowe, as a capitalist, came to the rescue. Perhaps tentatively at first, but certainly from 1597 as a regular system, he met the claims of poets and tradesmen as they fell due, and debited the sums advanced to a running account with the company, which forms the main subject-matter of the diary. Of course he had to recoup himself from time to time; and Dr. Greg has made it pretty clear that, when the system was in full working, he did this by

[1] Henslowe, i. 98, 'Jemes Cranwigge the 4 of November 1598 playd his callenge in my howsse & I sholde haue hade for my parte xxxx^{s} which the company hath receuyd & oweth y^{t} to me'. [2] Cf. vol. ii, p. 408.

claiming a lien upon the residue of the gallery takings which, although collected by his own ' gatherers ', would otherwise, under the tenancy agreement, have been handed over to the sharers. For a time he seems to have satisfied himself with reserving half of this residue towards his account. In July 1598, however, he notes in the diary ' Here I begyne to receue the wholle gallereys '. Even so the repayments did not keep pace with the expenditure, and from time to time he struck a balance and took an acknowledgement from the company of the amount of their outstanding debt. Most of Henslowe's advances were either for properties and apparel or for the writing of plays, and I see no reason to doubt that substantially the whole expenditure of the company under these two heads passed through his hands. Sometimes, but not always, he paid the fee demanded by the Master of the Revels for the licensing of a new play; and occasionally he put his hand in his pocket for travelling or legal expenses, or for the shot of a corporate jollification at a tavern. On the other hand, there were certain regular outgoings with which he had nothing to do, and for which the company must have had to make provision in other ways; for lighting and cleaning and the rushes which obviated the need for cleaning, for music, for the wages of stage attendants and those actors who were not sharers, the ' hirelings ', as they were called from an early date.[1] Probably the boys who took the female parts were apprenticed to individual sharers; in one case a boy was apprenticed to Henslowe, who charged the company or one of its members a weekly sum for his services.[2]

[1] Cf. Gosson, *S.A.* 39 (App. C, No. xxii), ' the very hyrelings of some of our players, which stand at reuersion of vi s by the weeke '; Dekker, *News from Hell* (*Works*, ii. 146), ' a companie of country players, being nine in number, one sharer, & the rest iornymen '; *The Raven's Almanac* (iv. 193), ' a number of you (especially the hirelings) shall be with emptie purses at least twice a week '; *Jests to Make you Merrie* (ii. 353), ' Nay, you mercenary soldiers, or you that are as the Switzers to players (I meane the hired men) by all the prognostications that I haue seene this yeare, you make but a hard and a hungry liuing of it by strowting [? ' strowling '] up and downe after the waggon. Leaue therefore, O leaue the company of such as lick the fat from your beards (if you haue any) and come hether, for here I know you shall be sharers '.

[2] Cf. Chapman, *May Day*, III. iii. 228, ' Afore heaven, 'tis a sweet fac'd child: methinks he would show well in woman's attire. . . . I'll help thee to three crownes a week for him, and she can act well '. The will of Augustine Phillips in 1605 mentions his apprentice James Sands, and his late apprentice, Samuel Gilburne. The ' boys ' of various Admiral's men appear in Henslowe's diary and in the Dulwich ' plots ' of plays; cf. Henslowe, i. 71, 73, ' Thomas Dowtones biger boy '; *Henslowe Papers*, 137, 138, 142, 147, ' E. Dutton his boye ', ' M^r. Allens boy ', ' M^r. Townes boy ', ' M^r. Jones his boy ', ' M^r. Denygtens little boy '.

It is, however, interesting to observe that in the case of the Admiral's men, the legal instruments which secured the continuity of the services of individual actors sometimes at least took the form, for sharers no less than for hirelings, not of bonds given to their fellows, but of contracts of service entered into, under penalties for breach, with Henslowe himself. As it was open to Henslowe to terminate these contracts, the constitution of the company was to a certain extent dependent upon his good will, and in fact he more than once refers to them as 'my company'.[1] He was not, however, in any strict sense the 'director' or even the 'manager' of the company. Dr. Greg more aptly describes him as their 'banker'.[2] The entries of his advances on their behalf are so worded as to imply that they were made on specific authorities given by one or more leading members of the company; and some of these authorities in fact exist in the shape of letters asking Henslowe to make payments to poets in respect of plays which the company have heard and approved. That in practice the banker had a considerable say in influencing the policy of the company is probable enough; and also that to the poor devils of poets he, rather than the actors, must have often appeared in the welcome guise of paymaster. Both poets and actors were under frequent personal obligations to him for small loans;[3] and he sometimes found the capital sum necessary to enable an actor to become a sharer, and took it back by instalments.[4]

Henslowe, i. 201; *Henslowe Papers*, 48. There is also a contract by which Thomas Downton of the Admiral's men hires an unnamed player (Henslowe, i. 40). Augustine Phillips (1605) calls Christopher Beeston his 'servant', and Nicholas Tooley (1623) calls Richard Burbadge, then deceased, his 'late master'. But Beeston and Tooley were King's men by patent before the dates in question, and it is a little difficult, though not impossible, to suppose that a hireling would appear in a patent. Probably the terms only retain the memory of former apprenticeships.

[2] Henslowe, ii. 120.

[3] The diary records loans to Jonson, Chapman, Porter, Chettle, Day, Haughton, Munday, Dekker, Anthony Wadeson, and Robert Wilson, and to the actors Martin Slater, John Singer, Thomas Towne, Edward Dutton, Robert Shaw, Thomas Downton, William Borne, John Helle, Gabriel Spencer, Richard Alleyn, John Tomson, Humphrey Jeffes, Anthony Jeffes, Richard Jones, Charles Massey, John Duke, Richard Bradshaw, Thomas Heywood, William Kempe, Thomas Blackwood, John Lowin, Abraham Savery, Richard Perkins; as well as to Henslowe's nephew, Francis Henslowe. Except Francis Henslowe and Abraham Savery, of the Queen's men, and John Tomson, of whom nothing is known, all these men are traceable in connexion with either the Admiral's or Worcester's men. A few of the loans to poets, e.g. to Chettle, seem to have been on behalf of the Admiral's men, rather than of Henslowe himself.

[4] Henslowe, i. 47, 63, 67, 'R^d. of Bengemenes Johnsones share as ffoloweth'; 'R^d. of Gabrell Spencer at severall tymes of his share in the

Henslowe's method of financing the Admiral's men endured for some time after their transference to the Fortune. Here, however, they prospered, and he notes himself in the diary as ' begininge to receue of thes meane ther privet deates which they owe vnto me '. The diary is practically closed in 1603. An exceptional entry in 1604 records that he ' caste vp all the acowntes from the begininge of the world vntell this daye ' with the Prince's men, as they had then become, and found ' all reconynges consernynge the company in stocke generall descarged & my sealfe descarged to them of al deates '. It is possible that henceforward the relations of the company were less with Henslowe than with Alleyn, with whom they had entered into some kind of ' composicion ' in 1600. Certainly the few remaining documents with regard to the Prince's men now at Dulwich seem to be of Alleyn rather than Henslowe *provenance*. Henslowe had, however, by agreement with Alleyn, a half interest in the ' house ' of the Fortune, an arrangement which may have been modified if, as seems probable, some of the sharers were taken into partnership as housekeepers in 1608. Henslowe had a running account with the Earl of Worcester's men at the Rose from 1602; and these relations had probably also terminated when, as the Queen's men, they set up on an independent basis at the Red Bull in 1604. About 1611–15, however, we again become able to study Henslowe's finances, shortly before his death, in a group of related documents which illustrate and are illustrated by the diary in an extremely interesting way.[1] The first of these is a bond in £500 given to Henslowe by the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1611 for the observance of certain articles. Unfortunately the articles are not annexed, but it may perhaps be taken for granted that they constituted an agreement under which the company were to play at a house provided by Henslowe. This may in the first instance have been the Swan, but in the spring of 1613 Henslowe probably acquired an interest in the Whitefriars, and in the following autumn he and his partner Jacob Meade entered into a contract with a builder to convert the old Bear Garden into a house capable of being used for plays, as well as for baiting. At this, which was renamed the Hope, the Lady Elizabeth's men certainly performed. The second document,

gallereyes as foloweth '; ' A juste acownte of the money which I haue receued of Humfreye Jeaffes hallffe sheare . . . as foloweth. . . . This some was payd backe agayne vnto the companey of my lord admeralles players . . . & they shared yt amonste them '. In such cases Henslowe may merely have acted as agent of the company in securing the payment out of gallery money of sums due from incoming sharers.

[1] *Henslowe Papers*, 18, 23, 86, 111, 123; cf. ch. xiii (Lady Elizabeth's).

in fact, consists of articles between Henslowe and Meade on the one side and Nathan Field on behalf of the company on the other, whereby the former undertake during a term of three years to house the company, to give them the use of an existing stock of apparel, including a suitable supply for travelling purposes if necessary, and to disburse such sums upon the furnishing of new plays with apparel as four or five sharers, whom Henslowe and Meade are to name for the purpose, may require. They also undertake to make similar disbursements for plays, receiving repayment after the second or third day's performance, to remove non-conforming players at the request of a majority of the company, and to hand over all forfeits for failures to attend rehearsal and the like. The close of the document is mutilated, but it is pretty clear that it provided for a nightly account of gallery takings, out of which Henslowe and Meade were to retain half for rent, and the other half towards the repayment of disbursements on apparel and of an outstanding debt of £124 until this should be extinguished. It is to be noted that, since the days of the Admiral's men, Henslowe had differentiated between the procedure for recovering his advances on account of apparel and of play-books respectively. The articles contemplate that individual players will be under contracts with Henslowe and Meade, and the third document is such a contract, dated 7 April 1614, with one Robert Dawes, who then joined the company. Certain covenants therein with regard to the personal conduct of the actor have already been described. In addition he bound himself to play for three years as a sharer in such company as Henslowe and Meade might appoint, and to consent to the retention by them of a moiety of the gallery and tiring-house takings for the use of the house, and of the other moiety towards the cost of apparel and the debt of £124. Henslowe and Meade also reserve the right to use the house for baiting on one day in each fortnight. The fourth document is the most illuminating of all. It is divided into two sections, one headed *Articles of Grieuance against Mr. Hinchlowe*, the other *Articles of Oppression against Mr. Hinchlowe*; and although unsigned was evidently drawn up by the company in the spring of 1615, for reference to some arbitrator, or perhaps to the Lord Chamberlain. The charges against Henslowe are partly of definite acts of dishonesty in the manipulation of his accounts with the company, partly of an oppressive use of his legal position to his own advantage and their detriment. If the allegations are well founded, he had cheated them by failing to bring to account sums due to them and to make

a heavy payment with which they were debited, by charging the common stock with loans made to individuals, by putting an inflated value upon apparel taken over from himself, by saddling them with the cost of an excessive number of gatherers and with bonuses which he had promised out of his own pocket, in order to induce particular actors to join the company. Under these heads they claim a heavy rebate against the debt of £600 which he was maintaining to be due from them. They assert that, to gain his ends, he had bribed their own representative Field; that while bonds had been taken from them to an amount far in excess of their real obligations, the articles binding Henslowe and Meade had never been signed; that Henslowe had taken advantage of this to repudiate his liability to hand over the apparel and play-books, for the greater part of which the company had already paid; and that he had similarly taken advantage of the fact that the agreements with the hired men were in his name to withdraw these men, and thus force a reconstruction of the company, whenever it suited his convenience. Thus, they say, 'within three yeares hee hath broken and dissmembred five companies'. It is a little difficult to make up the number of five companies, even if the Children of the Revels, who during the years covered by the statement were absorbed for a time in the Lady Elizabeth's men, are included. But the transactions described serve well to illustrate the distinction between the status of a company as a body of household servants and its status as a legal association, since there is no reason to doubt that, throughout all the shifting phases of its relations to Henslowe, a continuous body of players performed in public and at Court under the title of the Lady Elizabeth's men, and by authority of the patent issued to these men in 1611. One other point, in which Henslowe's earlier practice appears to have undergone modification by the period of his connexion with the Lady Elizabeth's men, emerges from his correspondence with the playwright Robert Daborne. Instead of merely paying for Daborne's plays as agent for the company, as had been his practice for the Admiral's and Lord Worcester's men, he appears to have bought the plays himself, and resold them, probably at a profit, to the company.[1]

The protesting players represent Henslowe's dealings with them as governed by a desire to be what the modern capitalist calls 'master in his own house'. They declare that he gave the reason of his often breaking with them in his own words,

[1] Cf. p. 375.

'Should these fellowes come out of my debt, I should have noe rule with them'. The principle is plausible enough, and is familiar to tradesmen in all poor neighbourhoods. The man burdened with debt must lose the fruits of his labour, because he is not free to revise his contracts on terms more beneficial to himself. Once the players got out of debt and accumulated a reserve fund, they would acquire their own theatre, and Henslowe's might stand empty. If the charges were justified—and as Dr. Greg points out, we have not Henslowe's answer—he certainly resorted to oppressive devices to prevent the Lady Elizabeth's men from achieving independence. It must not be too hastily assumed that he followed a similar policy in his earlier dealings with the Admiral's men. So far as we know, they brought no accusation against him, and the connexion seems to have been advantageous to both parties. The Admiral's men held together, and maintained a standing hardly inferior to that of their principal rivals, the Chamberlain's men. They had Alleyn for a fellow; and it may be that Alleyn, whose 'industrie and care', according to the deposition of a common acquaintance, 'were a great meanes of the bettering of the estate of the said Philip Henslowe', was able to give his partner advice, more equitable and perhaps in the long run not less profitable, even from the capitalist point of view, than was afterwards forthcoming from 'intemperate M^r. Meade'.[1] At any rate there is an agreement which shows that a compromise was arrived at after Henslowe's death with Alleyn and Meade upon the question of the disputed debt.[2] I am not Henslowe's biographer, and am therefore not concerned either to whitewash or to vilify his character. But it is fair to say that, outside the *Articles of Grievance and Oppression*, there is not much, in the mass of papers which have descended to us, that necessarily bears an unfavourable interpretation. Henslowe's private loans to players and poets were innumerable. They were generally, but not always, repaid, and it would be difficult to prove that he even exacted interest in such cases, although it is possible that the full sums entered in his accounts did not really change hands. On the other hand, too much stress must not be laid on the expressions of esteem with which his debtors approached him. Thus Daborne dwells on 'your tried curtesy' and 'the great love I have felt from you', and Field, addresses him as 'Father Hinchlow' and signs himself 'your loving son', as if he were Ben

[1] Henslowe, ii. 19.

[2] *Henslowe Papers*, 90, 93; cf. ch. xiii (Prince Charles's).

Jonson.[1] An application for money is, however, not even an affidavit. In his will he appears to have stated that he had not used his wife very well and would make amends ;[2] but his private correspondence reveals family affection and a turn for pious sentiment, probably sincere. Neither quality is necessarily inconsistent with unscrupulous methods of business. Whether Henslowe was a good or a bad man seems to me a matter of indifference. He was a capitalist. And my object is to indicate the disadvantages under which a company in the hands of a capitalist lay, in respect of independence and economic stability, as compared with one conducted upon the lines originally laid down by the Burbages for the tenants of the Globe. Not being owners of their own theatre, such a company were liable to eviction, and were drained to a large extent of the profits of their prosperous years. Relying upon their financier to meet in the first instance all extraordinary expenditure, they had no occasion to build up a reserve fund, and constantly tended to drift into debt. Organized upon a legal basis which made an act of association between the members of less importance than individual contracts entered into by sharers and hirelings alike with the capitalist, they were at his mercy if, for purposes of his own, he chose to use his powers under those contracts to bring about their dissolution.[3]

A few figures bearing on the actual profits of playing can be brought together. And first for the ' house '. Henslowe's takings at the Rose, as disclosed by the diary, seem to have averaged about 30*s.* a day during 1592–7. A short season at Newington Butts brought him in no more than 9*s.* a day. As the Rose was normally open for about 240 days in the year, his total annual receipts may be estimated at £360. No doubt the cost of upkeep was substantial. The landlord had to find a site, build a house, maintain it in repair, and take out a licence. The ground-rent of the Rose was £7, of the Globe £14 10*s.*, of the Fortune £16. The total rent of the site and building of the Blackfriars was £40. The building of the Fortune in 1600 cost £520, and its rebuilding in 1622 £1,000 ; the rebuilding of the Globe in 1613 about £1,400 ; the con-

[1] *Henslowe Papers*, 67, 70. [2] Henslowe, ii. 19.

[3] Similar methods were employed by Henslowe's rival, Francis Langley, at the Swan (q.v.) in 1597. He provided apparel for a company, and was allowed for it out of their ' moytie of the gains for the seuerall standinges in the galleries of the said howse which belonged to them '. Having quarrelled with the company before he was completely reimbursed, he kept the apparel. He took individual bonds to play with him for three years, released some of the company from their bonds, and sued the rest, who could not play without their fellows, for breach of contract.

version of the Bear Garden into the Hope in 1613, £360. There was probably some set-off in all these cases for the profits from taphouses and other tenements attached to the theatres; this was estimated at from £20 to £30 for the Globe and Blackfriars together in 1635. There were also occasional lettings to outsiders.[1] The housekeepers in 1635 complained of the 'chargeable reparacions'; in earlier years, when theatres were built largely of wood, they must have been more chargeable still. The Rose was not built earlier than 1587, but Henslowe had to spend £108 on it in 1592. The fee charged by the Master of the Revels for licensing a theatre rose during 1592–9 from £1 to £3 a month. The only estimates of net profits are for the King's men and of rather late date. The pleadings in *Ostler v. Heminges* (1615) give a single housekeeper's profits as £20 from one-fourteenth of the Globe and £20 from one-seventh of the Blackfriars, thus indicating £280 and £140 as the total annual value of the 'houses' at the Globe and Blackfriars respectively; those in *Witter v. Heminges and Condell* (1619), coming from a less trustworthy witness, allege that the Globe was worth £420 to £560 before the fire and more after the rebuilding.[2] The bearing of the figures is complicated by our ignorance of the proportions in which the King's men made use of their two theatres. By 1635 the importance of the Blackfriars had outstripped that of the Globe. Its 'house' then yielded £700–£800 a year; that of the Globe about 54*s.* a day, nearly twice as much as the Rose half a century earlier.

As to the earnings of a sharer we have even less information. One of the disputants in 1635 put them at no more than 3*s.* a day at the Globe; another at £180 a year from all sources. If both were accurate, the Blackfriars must by that date have been doing far better business than the Globe, even after allowing for the inclusion in the £180 of a share of the fees for private performances at Court and elsewhere. The customary Court fee was £10, or £6 13*s.* 4*d.* if the King was not present. Private performances were ordinarily at night, and did not interfere with public performances in the afternoon. If the Court was out of London, however, the theatre had to be closed. No special allowance seems to have been made for this until about 1631, when the fee was doubled for a performance in the daytime or away from London.[3] The King's men got the principal share of the Court work,

[1] J. Hall, *Virgedemiarum* (1597), i. 3, appears to satirize performances by amateurs 'upon a hired stage'; cf. p. 361.

[2] Similarly in *Keysar v. Burbadge* (1610) the pleadings of Robert Keysar grossly exaggerated the profits of the Blackfriars.

[3] Cf. ch. vii.

being called on in 1611–12 for as many as twenty-two plays. Their Court fees during 1603–16 amounted on an average to £125 a year.[1] The exact number of sharers is not known; it was probably not more than twelve. All things considered, it is not unreasonable to put the earnings of a sharer in the King's men during the first decade of the seventeenth century at about £100 to £150 a year, to which, if he were a 'housekeeper' with an interest in both houses, he might be able to add another £40 or £50. This estimate agrees with Sir Henry Herbert's valuation of the shares which he held before the war in the companies other than the King's at £100 each on an average.[2] Sir Sidney Lee's figure of £700 for Shakespeare's total professional income, which includes £40 for the books of his plays, seems to me vastly overestimated.[3] Even the more modest £200 or so was a handsome income for the time, since the purchasing power of money in the seventeenth century is variously reckoned at from five to eight times as much as at present. Of course, in times of inhibition from plague or other cause the income vanished altogether, and was very inadequately replaced by the meagre gains of travelling, together with the allowance made by King James to his men for private practice during the infection.

The gross takings of the sharers were naturally much greater. But they were subject to heavy outgoings. The King's men reckoned these in 1635 at £3 a day or from £900 to £1,000 a year for hired 'journeymen' and boys, music, lights, and so forth, in addition to 'extraordinary' charges for apparel and poets.[4] The wages of a hireling are given by Gosson

[1] Cf. App. B.

[2] *Variorum*, iii. 266.

[3] Lee, 315; cf. A. Thaler, *Shakespeare's Income* (*S. P.* xv. 82), who halves Lee's estimate.

[4] In 1628 Sir Henry Herbert notes in his office-book (*Variorum*, iii. 176), 'The Kinges company with a general consent and alacritye [poor devils! E. K. C.] have given mee the benefitt of too dayes in the yeare, the one in summer, thother in winter, to bee taken out of the second daye of a revived playe, att my owne choyse. The housekeepers have likewyse given their shares, their dayly charge only deducted, which comes to some 2[l] 5[s]. this 25 May, 1628.' Herbert words it oddly, but the 'dayly charge' must be that of the sharers, not the housekeepers, who had none, and the estimate agrees fairly with that of 1635. Herbert took during 1628–33 sums of from £1 5*s.* to £6 7*s.*, averaging £4 8*s.* 6*d.*, out of five performances at the Globe, and £9 16*s.* to £17 10*s.*, averaging £13 10*s.*, from five performances at the Blackfriars. The gross takings averaged therefore £6 13*s.* 6*d.* at the Globe and £15 15*s.* at the Blackfriars. In 1633 Herbert compounded for a payment of £10 at Christmas and £10 at Midsummer. But in 1662 (*Variorum*, iii. 266) he included amongst the incomings of his office the profits of a summer's day and a winter's day at the Blackfriars, which he valued at £50 each.

in 1579 as 6*s.* a week; some of Henslowe's agreements of 1597 provide for wages of 5*s.*, 6*s.* 8*d.*, and 8*s.*[1] There was some economy to be secured by doubling small parts.[2] How far this was facilitated by any use of masks is open to doubt.[3] Boys were regularly employed to take female parts, and although it would be going rather too far to say that a woman never appeared upon an Elizabethan stage, women were not included in the ordinary companies.[4] The boys were apprenticed to individuals, and their masters had to pay rather than receive premiums. In return they charged wages to the company. Henslowe gave £8 for a boy in 1597 and got 3*s.* a week from the Admiral's for his wages. John Shank in 1635 claimed that he had had to give £40 for a single boy, and £200 in all.[5] Contributions to local rates came to about £5 a year.[6] The cost of apparel and properties is difficult to estimate. A company bought or accumulated a stock, and might also have at its disposal a stock belonging to the owner of its theatre. Individual actors may have had their private wardrobes.[7] Fresh purchases were only necessitated by new productions, but these were frequent. The special mounting of Court performances was helped out by the Revels Office.[8] The actor in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit* (1592) boasted that his share of apparel would not be sold for

[1] Cf. p. 363 and ch. xiii (Admiral's).

[2] Cf. W. W. Greg in *T. L. S.* (12 Feb. 1920) and his analysis of the Dulwich 'plots' (*H. P.* 152). Here also we find the tireman, gatherers, and attendants used as 'supers'.

[3] Puttenham, i. 14, says that Roscius 'brought vp these vizards, which we see at this day vsed'. In *The Longer Thou Livest*, 1748, 1796, God's Judgement has 'a terrible visure' and Confusion 'an ill fauowred visure', and in *All For Money*, 389, 1440, 1462, Damnation, Judas, and Dives have vizards. But this is early evidence, and perhaps drawn from the private stage. Harington, *Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596, *An Anatomy*, 5), speaks of 'an ill-favoured vizor, such as I have seen in stage plays, when they dance Machachinas', but this rather tells against the use by ordinary actors at that date.

[4] Women only began to act regularly at the Restoration; cf. Ward, iii. 253. There had been occasional earlier examples; even in 1611 Coryat, *Crudities*, i. 386, says that at Venice 'I saw women acte, a thing that I never saw before, though I have heard that it hathe beene sometimes used in London'. The exceptions are, I think, such as prove the rule; private plays such as *Hymen's Triumph*, Venner's gulling show of *England's Joy*, the Italian tumblers of 1574, the virago Moll Frith at the Fortune (cf. ch. xxiii, s.v. Dekker, *Roaring Girl*). On 22 Feb. 1583 Richard Madox 'went to the theater to see a scurvie play set out al by one virgin, which there proved a fyemarten without voice, so that we stayed not the matter' (*Cotton MSS. App.* xlvii, f. 6^{v}; cf. *S. P. Colonial, E. Indies*, 221). As to the skill of the boys, cf. Ben Jonson on Richard Robinson in *The Devil is an Ass*, II. viii. 64.

[5] Halliwell-Phillipps, i. 316.

[6] Cf. ch. xvi (Swan).

[7] Cf. ch. xiii (Admiral's).

[8] Cf. ch. vii.

£200, but he was fictitious. Richard Jones, in fact, sold his share in a stock of apparel, play-books, instruments, and other commodities for £37 10*s.* in 1589. The cost of such things has a tendency to grow. If the sums of from £50 to £80 received by retiring sharers early in the seventeenth century may be taken as representing their interests in the stocks, the total value of the contents of a tiring-house might be anything from £500 to £1,000. Henslowe sold the stock of the Lady Elizabeth's men for £400 in 1615; apparently this did not include their play-books, which they valued at £200. I reckon that in 1597–1603 Henslowe spent in all £1,317 for the Admiral's men, or about £1 for each day of playing; of this play-books accounted for £652, apparel and properties for £561, and miscellaneous expenses for £103. The garments, by Henslowe's time at least, had become costly enough, as much as £19 being given for a single cloak, while a tailor was employed to make up satin at 12*s.* 6*d.* and velvet at £1 a yard.[1] Second-hand finery was sometimes to be obtained from a serving-man or a needy courtier.[2] It was probably the lavish use of apparel, more than anything else, which led both friends and foes to dwell upon the stately furnishing of the English theatres.[3] Strictly scenic effects were limited by the structural conditions of the stage, and Henslowe's inventories do not suggest that any vast stock of movable properties was kept.[4] Animals and monsters were freely introduced.[5] Living dogs and even horses may have been trained; but your lion or bear or dragon was a creature of skin and brown paper.[6]

An old 'book' could be bought for £2, but the value to the company might be much more. A good stock piece was

[1] Cf. ch. xiii (Admiral's).

[2] Cf. the account of Platter in 1599 (ch. xvi, introduction); also Donne, *Satire*, iv. 180 (ed. *Muses' Library*, ii. 196):

> As fresh and sweet their apparels be, as be
> The fields they sold to buy them. 'For a king
> Those hose are,' cry the flatterers; and bring
> Them next week to the theatre to sell;

and Jonson, *Underwoods*, xxxii:

> Is it for these that Fine-man meets the street
> Coached, or on foot-cloth, thrice changed every day,
> To teach each suit he has the ready way
> From Hyde Park to the stage, where at the last
> His dear and borrowed bravery he must cast.

[3] Cf. App. C, Nos. xxx, xlvi; *Case Is Altered*, ii. 4, 'Theatres! ay, and plays too, both tragedy and comedy, and set forth with as much state as can be imagined'; cf. Graves, 68.

[4] Cf. chh. xx, xxi *passim*, and *Henslowe Papers*, 113. [5] Wegener, 135.

[6] *Henslowe Papers*, 117, 'j lyone skin; j beares skyne . . . j dragon in fostes [*Faustus*] j lyone; ij lyone heades; j great horse with his leages; j black dogge'. For brown paper monsters, cf. App. C, Nos. xxii, xxx, and for a controversy as to the use of live animals, ch. xx.

a perpetual 'get-penny' and could, of course, be furbished up from time to time.[1] In *Downton v. Slater* (1598) the Admiral's men valued a misappropriated book at £13 6*s.* 8*d.* and claimed £30 damages for withholding it. The court awarded £10 10*s.* New plays cost more, and entailed fees of 7*s.* each to the Master of the Revels for licensing.[2] A play by Greene would fetch £6 13*s.* 4*d.* about 1592. The prices paid by the Admiral's and Lord Worcester's men between 1597 and 1603 ranged from £4 to £10 10*s.*; a fee of £6 may be taken as about normal. 'An they'll give me twenty pounds a play, I'll not raise my vein', says Antonio Balladino, who is Anthony Munday, in *The Case is Altered*, a play of about 1598.[3] In 1613 Robert Daborne was bargaining for plays with Henslowe at rates of from £10 to £20, and boasting that he could get £25 elsewhere. It seems likely that Henslowe charged a commission on these prices to the company. There are some traces of the system, used at a later date, by which the author was entitled to a 'benefit' night shortly after the production of a new play.[4] He was also

[1] *E. Hoe*, IV. ii. 92, 'thy name shall be written upon conduits, and thy deeds plaid i' thy lifetime by the best companies of actors, and be call'd their get-peny'; *Barth. Fair*, v. i. 13 (of a 'motion'), 'the *Gunpowder-plot*, there was a get-peny! I haue presented that to an eighteene, or twenty pence audience, nine times in an afternoone'. Dekker, *News from Hell* (1606, *Works*, ii. 146), speaks of 'a Cobler of Poetrie called a play-patcher'.

[2] Henslowe, ii. 115; cf. ch. x. By the end of Sir Henry Herbert's time the fee had been raised to £2; even for an old play he exacted £1 (*Variorum*, iii. 266).

[3] *C. is A.* I. i.

[4] Henslowe, i. 113, 136 (Admiral's, 1599, 1601), 181 (Worcester's, 1602), 'for M^r. Mundaye & the reste of the poets at the playnge of S^r John Oldcastell the ferste tyme' [*in margin*, 'as a gefte']; 'John Daye . . . after the playinge of the 2 part of Strowde'; 'Thomas Deckers . . . over & above his price of his boocke called A Medysen for a Cvrste Wiffe'. These are exceptional disbursements. The Daborne-Henslowe correspondence of 1613–14 (*Henslowe Papers*, 71, 75, 76, 82) suggests a more regular practice: 'I pay you half my earnings in the play'; 'We will hav but twelv pownds and the overplus of the second day'; 'You shall hav the whole companies bonds to pay you the first day of my play being playd'; 'I desyr you should disburse but 12^l a play till they be playd'. Probably the actual day selected for the poet's benefit varied; thus the third day is suggested by Dekker's prologue to *If It be not Good, the Devil is in It* (1612), a Red Bull play:

> not caring, so he gains
> A cram'd third day, what filth drops from his brains.

Malone (*Variorum*, iii. 157) quotes later evidence for a variation of days, together with Davenant, *The Play-house to be Let*:

> There is an old tradition,
> That in the times of mighty Tamberlane,
> Of conjuring Faustus and the Beauchamps bold,
> You poets used to have the second day.
> This shall be ours, sir, and tomorrow yours.

The actual term 'benefit' appears first in connexion with the interest of

entitled to free admission to the house.[1] The poets received their fees from Henslowe in instalments, drawing £1 or so in 'earnest' when the commission was given, and as each batch of sheets was handed in, and the balance when the play was finished. This plan proved disastrous to them. The instalments often found them in a debtor's prison, and some of them became mere bond-slaves.[2] Thus both Henry Porter and Henry Chettle were reduced to making agreements which pledged them to write for no other company than the Admiral's. The device is familiar to the modern publisher. Robert Daborne's correspondence with Henslowe is eloquent of the straits to which a hack playwright might be brought. Daborne was a man of good family, and had lawsuits about his 'estate', which added to his embarrassments. He had been interested in the management of the Queen's Revels, and it may have been the absorption of this company by the Lady Elizabeth's men that brought him into contact with Henslowe. His letters preserved at Dulwich run from April 1613 to July 1614.[3] During this period he was engaged upon at least four plays. The history of one of them, the tragedy of *Machiavel and the Devil*, may be taken as typical. On 17 April 1613 he signed an agreement to complete it by the end of May for an 'earnest' of £6 down, £4 on completion of three acts, and £10 'vpon delivery in of y^e^ last scean perfited'; and for the observance of the agreement he gave a bond of £20. On 25 April he wrote to borrow £1 from Henslowe, explaining that he was 'vpon y^e^ sodeyn put to a great extremity in bayling my man committed to Newgate vpon taking a possession for me', and had unfortunately taken 'less money of my kinsman a lawier that was with me then servd my turn'. On 3 May he got another £1, although the three acts were not yet finished; another on 8 May;

the Master of the Revels (cf. p. 370), not that of the poet. Nor do we know what exactly the 'overplus' assigned to the poet was calculated upon.

[1] *B. Fair*, v. iii. 30, 'What, doe you not know the *Author*, fellow *Filcher*? you must take no money of him; he must come in *gratis*: M^r^. *Littlewit* is a voluntary; he is the *Author*'.

[2] Henslowe, i. 83, 100, 101, 107, 119 (Admiral's, 1598–1600), 'to discharge M^r^. Dicker owt of the counter in the Powltrey'; 'Harey Chettell to paye his charges in the Marshallsey'; 'to descarge Thomas Dickers frome the areaste of my lord chamberlens men'; 'to descarge Harey Chettell of his areste from Ingrome'; 'W^m^ Harton to releace hime owt of the Clyncke'; also Henslowe, i. 103, 165 (Admiral's, 1599, 1602), 'Harey Porter . . . gaue me his faythfulle promysse that I shold haue alle the boockes which he writte ether him sellfe or with any other'; 'at the sealleynge of H Chettells band to writte for them'.

[3] *Henslowe Papers*, 67; cf. ch. xiii (Lady Elizabeth's).

and another on 16 May, making £11 in all. 'Sir,' he wrote, 'my occations of expenc have bin soe great & soe many I am ashamed to think how much I am forct to press you.' On 19 May he had probably handed in his three acts, as he then signed an acquittance for £16 received up to date, noting at the foot 'This play to be delivered in to Mr. Hinchlaw with all speed'. It was not, however, ready by 31 May, and on 5 June came a piteous appeal for an advance of £2 'which stands me vpon to send over to my counsell in a matter concerns my whole estate'. Henslowe shall not be the loser by his kindness: 'wher I deale otherways then to your content may I & myne want ffryndship in distress'. By 10 June, 'y^e necessity of term busines exacts me beyond my custom to be trublesome vnto you', to the tune of yet another £1. By this time Henslowe was evidently calling out for the play; and Daborne protests, 'I perceav you misdoubt my readynes. Sir, I would not be hyred to break my ffayth with you; before God they shall not stay one hour for me.' He was still protesting on 25 June; but soon after must have brought *Machiavel and the Devil* to an end and drawn the £1 still due to him on balance, since on 18 June he was already beginning to negotiate for his next play, *The Arraignment of London*. And so the correspondence goes on; the instalments always anticipated, the applications always larded with declarations of his own honesty and with mingled flattery and complaint of a patron who, generous as he was, showed an inexplicable tendency to 'meat' Daborne 'by y^e common measuer of poets'. The result was inevitable. Daborne's terms came down from £20 to £12 and even £10 a play; and in addition to reselling to the company at a profit, Henslowe seems on one occasion at least to have squeezed out of Daborne 'half my earnings in the play', by which, I take it, the proceeds of his benefit are meant. By the end of 1613 Daborne was in considerable distress; 'if you doe not help me to tenn shillings by this bearer, by the living God I am vtterly disgract'. There is not much more of the correspondence. It is clear from another source that Daborne did not for some time get free, for when Henslowe lay on his death-bed, Mrs. Daborne called for some papers belonging to her husband, and Henslowe gave her a bond for £20 of which she was ignorant, possibly the very bond signed for *Machiavel and the Devil*, saying, 'I knowe you and with all my hart doe freely forgive you all that you owe me'.[1] By 1618 Daborne had taken orders. He became Chancellor of Waterford and Prebendary

[1] Henslowe, ii. 20.

and Dean of Lismore, and thus, as a contemporary poem has it, ' died amphibious by the ministry '.

The wrongs of authors are not inarticulate, and they have an appeal to posterity from the injustice of their age. The exploitation of poets by the playing companies brought about some cross-currents in the tone of the allusions to the theatre, which are so frequent in occasional literature. On the one hand, the pamphleteers, and in a less degree the satirists, are with the players as against their enemies the Puritans; on the other hand, they have their own grievances to publish and avenge. A note of hostility makes its appearance not long after the first invasion of the province of stage-writing by the university wits; and by the embittered close of Robert Greene's reckless life the relations were acute. Thomas Lodge in 1589 swore to abandon dramas and ' pennie-knaves delight '.[1] Thomas Nashe canvassed the players in his prefatory epistle to Greene's *Menaphon* (1589), and Greene himself, with humour in his *Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), and in his autobiographical romances of *Never Too Late* (1590) and *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1592), and with unsparing invective in the warning *To those Gentlemen his Quondam Acquaintance, that spend their Wits in making Plaies*, which he appended to the latter. In these pamphlets the ' vaine glorious tragedians ' are twitted with their mouthings on the stage, with their chameleon-like shifting from the service of one lord to that of another,[2] with the contrast between their rapid rise to wealth and their obscurity when they carried their fardles afootback upon the roads, with the romances and morals—*Delphrigus* and *The King of the Fairies*, *Man's Wit*, and the *Dialogue of Dives*—that formed their stock-in-trade before the masters of arts came to their rescue. But the real gravamen is that they live on the wits of scholars. They are ' apes ', ' buckram gentlemen ', ' a company of taffaty fooles ' tricked up with poets' feathers, ' puppits that speake from our mouths ', ' anticks garnisht in our colours '. They cleave like burrs to their victims. An alleged comparison by Cicero of the Roman actor Roscius to the crow in Aesop is called in aid, and the taunt of ' vpstart crow, beautified with our feathers ' is not spared to an actor before whose dramatic

[1] Lodge, *Scillaes Metamorphosis* (1589):

by oath he bound me
To write no more of that whence shame doth grow,
Or tie my pen to Pennie-knaves delight.

[2] The pun on ' comoedians ' and ' camoelions ' had been made by ' certayne gentlemen ' against the Duttons as early as 1580; cf. ch. xiii (Warwick's). It is still in use in *Ratseis Ghost* (1605); cf. p. 340, n. 2.

genius that of Greene and his fellows was to fade as a rush-light before the sun.[1] The actors had something on their side to complain of, with Greene no less than with Daborne. In a remorseful moment he tells us of the 'arch-plaimaking poet' Roberto, how 'what euer he fingered aforehand was the certaine meanes to vnbinde a bargaine'; and a detractor accuses him of selling the same play to two companies, and defending himself by maintaining that no faith was to be kept with players.[2] During the seventeenth century, it is

[1] The Aesopic allusion is complicated by another to the story in Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, ii. 4, 30, perhaps based on Martial, xiv. 73, of the cobbler who tried to teach a crow to say 'Ave Caesar' in flattery of Augustus after the battle of Actium; cf. Mr. McKerrow's note to Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* (*Works*, iv. 105). Both ideas are suggested in Nashe's *Menaphon* preface, and Greene, in *Francescos Fortunes* (App. C, No. xliii), combines them with a third story, also due, perhaps through Cornelius Agrippa (App. C, No. xii), to Macrobius (*Sat.* III. xiv. 12), of a debate on the respective powers of orator and actor between Cicero and Roscius, into an obviously apocryphal jest: '*Cicero.* Why *Roscius*, art thou proud with *Esops* Crow, being pranct with the glory of others feathers? Of thy selfe thou canst say nothing, and if the Cobler hath taught thee to say *Aue Caesar*, disdain not thy tutor, because thou pratest in a kings chamber.' Fleay, i. 258, chooses to identify the cobbler with Marlowe and Roscius with Robert Wilson, and (being ignorant of Macrobius) cites the use of the phrase 'Ave Caesar' in *Edward III*, I. i. 164, which he ascribes to Marlowe, as evidence. Such equations are always hazardous. The point of the passage is in the indebtedness of the players as a body to the poets as a body. If any individual actor were designated as Roscius about 1590, it would be more likely to be Alleyn than another; the compliment to him is not unusual later (cf. ch. xv). But he had hardly a monopoly of the name; and in the present case there is really no reason to suppose that Greene had any individual in mind, other than the historical Roscius. The name is given to Ostler (q.v.) in 1611, and was in common generic use for a player; cf. e.g. Marston, *Satires* (1598), ii. 42:

> That fair-framed piece of sweetest poesy,
> Which Muto put between his mistress' paps . . .
> Was penned by Roscio the tragedian;

and *Scourge of Villainy* (1598), xi. 40:

> Say who acts best? Drusus or Roscio?

Similarly Fleay, ii. 279, has no real ground for supposing that the player in the *Groatsworth of Wit* is Wilson in particular. If, again, any individual is meant, it might just as well be James Burbage. Throughout Fleay is inclined to exaggerate the extent of the theatrical references in the pamphlets of Greene and Nashe. But R. Simpson is much worse in his hopelessly uncritical Introduction to *Faire Em* in *The School of Shakspere*, ii. 339, which is an attempt to trace a *vendetta* against the actors and especially Shakespeare as a main motive in Greene's writing from 1584 onwards. As far as I can see, Greene's attacks on the stage are limited to the three pamphlets named in the text, and Nashe's to the *Menaphon* preface. It is doubtful whether Greene was writing for the stage at all before about 1590; in any case it may be assumed that neither writer was normally engaged in tilting against his paymasters.

[2] Cuthbert Conny-Catcher, *The Defence of Conny-Catching* (1592, Greene, *Works*, xi. 75), 'What if I should prove you a Conny-Catcher, Maister

mainly Dekker, as critic of the players, no less than in other ways, who carries on the tradition of Greene and Nashe.[1] Himself an active playwright, it is with black looks that he stands by, in thronged term-time or at the coming of ambassadors, and watches the companies battening upon the fruits of divine poetry, like swine on acorns; and when plague arrives, although his own occupation be gone, it is with savage glee that he sees the flag hauled down and the doors closed, and his gloomy paymasters setting out once more on the hard life of 'strowlers'.

One interesting result of the feud between poets and players was that some of the former were led to encourage and even acquire financial interests in a rival type of theatrical organization which for a time at least entered into successful competition with the professional companies. This organization rested upon the use of boy actors. I have elsewhere expounded the important share taken by school plays in the earlier development of the Renaissance drama.[2] The grammar schools of

R. G. would it not make you blush at the matter? . . . Aske the Queens Players, if you sold them not *Orlando Furioso* for twenty Nobles, and when they were in the country sold the same Play to the Lord Admirals men for as much more. Was not this plaine *Conny-Catching*, Maister *R. G.*? . . . But I hear, when this was objected, you made this excuse; that there was no more faith to be held with players than with them that valued faith at the price of a feather; for as they were comedians to act, so the actions of their lives were Camelion-like; that they were uncertain, variable, time-pleasers, men that measured honesty by profit, and that regarded their authors not by desert, but by necessity of time.'

[1] Dekker, *Jests to Make you Merrie* (1607, *Works*, ii. 303, 352), 'As proud as a player that feedes on the fruite of diuine poetry (as swine on acorns). . . . O you that are the Poets of these sinfull times, ouer whome the Players haue now got the vpper hand, by making fooles of the poore country people, in driuing them like flockes of geese to sit cackling in an old barne: and to swallow downe those playes for new which here euery punck and her squire (like the interpreter and his poppet) can rand out by heart they are so stale, and therefore so stincking; I know the Lady Pecunia and you come very hardly together, & therefore trouble not you'; cf. his references to 'strowlers' in note to p. 332. Another seventeenth century critic is H[enry] P[arrot], *Laquei Ridiculosi or Springes for Woodcocks* (1613), *Epig.* 131, *Theatrum Licencia*:

> Cotta's become a player most men know,
> And will no longer take such toyling paines;
> For here 's the spring (saith he) whence pleasures flow
> And brings them damnable excessive gaines:
> That now are cedars growne from shrubs and sprigs,
> Since Greene's *Tu Quoque* and those Garlicke Jigs.

[2] *Mediaeval Stage*, ii. 194, 214. For Elizabethan school-plays at Shrewsbury, cf. ch. xxiii, s.v. Ashton. Murray, ii. 204, 216, 243, 324, 364, 382, records plays by schoolboys or other children at Bath (1602), Bristol (1594), Coventry (1601–2), Ludlow (1562, 1575–6), Norwich (1564–5), Plymouth (Totnes boys, 1564–74).

Eton, Westminster, and Merchant Taylors and the song schools of the Chapel Royal, Windsor, St. Paul's and the private chapel of the Earl of Oxford continued, far into Elizabeth's reign, to give their performances at Court side by side with the growing companies of noble and royal servants. It was not until the professionals called upon the university wits and began to mingle literary with popular elements in their productions that the destinies of the drama passed definitely into their hands. The earlier boy companies died out soon after 1590. A decade later the Paul's and Chapel companies were revived, the latter at least under somewhat new economic conditions. Formerly the plays had been managed by schoolmasters and song-masters, as by-activities of institutions primarily established for other objects. For the revived Paul's plays, so far as we know, Edward Pearce, the choirmaster, was similarly responsible. The Chapel children, on the other hand, were placed upon a more regular business footing. The official Master of the Children, Nathaniel Giles, took part in the undertaking; and the royal commission to impress singing boys, which he held, was unscrupulously used to compel the services of boys who could not sing, and were only needed as recruits for the stage. But long before James had come to the decision that on religious grounds the connexion between the Chapel and the plays must be broken, the actual control of the organization had passed from the Master to a financial syndicate, associated much on the principle adopted by the ordinary playing companies, whose members hired a theatre, charged themselves with the maintenance of the boys and of the performances, and divided up the profits as their reward. During the history of the Chapel boys and of the group of Revels companies which succeeded them, several of these syndicates came into existence, and shares in one or other of them were held by Marston, Drayton, Barry, Mason, Daborne, and very possibly also by other dramatists. The articles of association of the King's Revels company in 1608 may perhaps be taken as typical. One of the sharers, Martin Slater the actor, who was evidently a kind of manager, is to have lodgings in the theatre, which was the Whitefriars, and the right to sell refreshments, and is to travel with the children if necessary, in which event he is to enjoy a share and a half in the profits. The children are to be apprenticed to him for three years each, and he is to bind himself in £40 not to transfer the indentures. The ' whole chardges of the howse, the gatherers, the wages, the childrens bourd, musique, booke keeper, tyreman, tyrewoman, lights, the Maister of the revells duties,

and all other things needefull and necessary' are to be deducted in due proportions from each day's takings, so that the company may not run into debt. No sharer is to take away any apparel or other common property, or print any play-book, on pain of losing his interest.

The boys played in what were called 'private' houses, and it is not quite clear how far they were amenable to the usual principles of stage regulation; an order by the Privy Council to the Lord Mayor to suppress plays during the Lent of 1601 was obviously intended to be enforced against them. Their performances, especially while they were novel, proved a serious menace to the prosperity of the adult companies. The classical allusions on the subject are that of Jonson in *The Poetaster* to the winter of 1600–1, which made the players poorer than so many starved snakes,[1] and the elaborate apology for the travelling of the company in *Hamlet*, which is so germane to the matter now under discussion that it must, however familiar, be given in full:[2]

Hamlet. . . . What players are they?

Rosin. Euen those you were wont to take delight in the Tragedians of the City.

Ham. How chances it they trauaile? their residence both in reputation and profit was better both wayes.

Rosin. I thinke their Inhibition comes by the meanes of the late Innouation?

Ham. Doe they hold the same estimation they did when I was in the City? Are they so follow'd?

Rosin. No indeed, they are not.

Ham. How comes it? doe they grow rusty?

Rosin. Nay, their indeauour keepes in the wonted pace; But there is Sir an ayrie of Children, little Yases, that crye out on the top of question; and are most tyrannically clap't for 't: these are now the fashion, and so be-ratled the common Stages (so they call them) that

[1] *Poetaster*, III. iv. 344, 'O, it will get vs a huge deale of money, Captaine, and wee haue need on 't; for this winter ha 's made vs all poorer, then so many staru'd snakes: No bodie comes at vs; not a gentleman, nor a ——.'

[2] *Hamlet*, II. ii. 339. This is the Folio text. The Second Quarto omits all but the first ten lines, but that there was some reference to the children in the original version of the play, the date of which may be 1601, is shown by the First Quarto text:

Hamlet. How comes it that they trauell? Do they grow restie?
Gilderstone. No my lord, their reputation holds as it was wont.
Hamlet. How then?
Gilderstone. Yfaith my Lord, noueltie carries it away,
For the principall publike audience that
Came to them, are turned to private playes,
And to the humour of children.

many wearing Rapiers, are affraide of Goose-quils, and dare scarse come thither.

Ham. What are they Children? Who maintains 'em? How are they escoted? Will they pursue the Quality no longer then they can sing? Will they not say afterwards if they should grow themselues to common Players (as it is like most if their meanes are no better) their Writers do them wrong, to make them exclaim against their owne Succession.

Rosin. Faith there ha's bene much to do on both sides: and the Nation holds it no sinne, to tarre them to Controuersie. There was for a while, no mony bid for argument, vnlesse the Poet and the Player went to Cuffes in the Question.

Ham. Is 't possible?

Guild. Oh there ha's beene much throwing about of Braines.

Ham. Do the Boyes carry it away?

Rosin. I that they do my Lord, *Hercules* & his load too.

The be-rattling of the common stages and their spirited replies, thought by some to include a 'purge' in *Troilus and Cressida*, with which Shakespeare 'put down' Ben Jonson, form an element in the literary conflict known as 'the war of the theatres', in which, however, this issue is much complicated with others arising from the personalities of the dramatists engaged, and notably from that of Ben Jonson himself.[1]

[1] The main interest of the 'war of the theatres', or 'Poetomachia' as Dekker, *Satiromastix*, Epist. 10, calls it, is for literature and biography, rather than for stage-history. I refer to it under the plays concerned in chh. xxiii, xxiv, and can only add a brief summary here. The treatment of R. A. Small, *The Stage Quarrel* (1899), is excellent, and may be supplemented by H. C. Hart's papers, *Gabriel Harvey, Marston and Ben Jonson* (*9 N. Q.* xi. 201, 281, 343, 501; xii. 161, 263, 342, 403, 482) and *On Carlo Buffone* (*10 N. Q.* i. 381), while the less critical view, partly derived from Fleay, of J. H. Penniman, *The War of the Theatres* (1897), is revised in his edition of *Poetaster* and *Satiromastix*. The protagonists are Jonson and Marston, with whom became allied Dekker. Daniel and many others, whose names have been brought under discussion, do not seem to have been really concerned. Jonson himself tells us, in the *Apologetical Dialogue*, probably written late in 1601, to *Poetaster* that 'three yeeres, They did provoke me with their petulant stiles On every stage'. This takes us to 1599, up to which year there is no just ground for suggesting any conflict between Jonson and Marston. Jonson may then have taken offence at Marston's portrait of him, intended to be complimentary, as Chrisoganus in *Histriomastix*. In the same year he criticized Marston's style in *E. M. O.* In 1600 Marston satirized Jonson as Brabant Senior in *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, and in 1601 as Lampatho Doria in *What You Will*. Jonson in turn brought Marston into *Poetaster* (1601) as Crispinus, and added Dekker as Demetrius. Dekker retorted a month or two later with his caricature of Jonson as Horace in *Satiromastix*. Some unascertained part in the 'purge' given to Jonson is ascribed in *3 Parnassus* (1601) to Shakespeare. Jonson and Marston seem to have been reconciled by 1603; but the dispute had not been merely a paper one, for Jonson, *Conversations*, 11, 20, claims that he 'beat Marston, and took his pistol from him'.

Thus is explained the apparent paradox by which plays as well as pamphlets become the vehicle of attacks upon players. Three such plays, *Histriomastix*, *The Poetaster*, and the second part of *The Return from Parnassus*, call for special attention. The player-scenes in *Histriomastix* seem to belong mainly, though not wholly, to the original form of the play, which I regard as an outcome of the campaign of Robert Greene and his fellows about 1590, although the extant text, not printed until 1610, represents a later recension, probably undertaken by Marston, as one of the 'musty fopperies of antiquity' produced by the Paul's boys about 1600.[1] The piece is of the nature of a political morality, and the scenes in question serve as one illustration of its general theme, which is that of the cyclical rotation of society through the successive stages of Peace, Plenty, Pride, Envy, War, Poverty, and so to Peace again. Many side-lights are thrown upon the methods of company organization which have already been described in these pages. In Act I some idle and drunken artisans, Gulch, Clout, Belch the beard-maker, Gut the fiddle-string-maker, Incle the pedlar, combine to form a company. Their poet is Master Posthaste, whom they call a gentleman scholar, but who is evidently a caricature of Anthony Munday, dramatist and Messenger of the Chamber. A scrivener is called in to 'tye a knott of knaves togither', and Bougle the mercer will furnish them with 'rich stuff' at a price. They call themselves Sir Oliver Owlet's men, and take his badge of an owl in an ivy-bush. In Act II they appear on the steps of a market cross and 'cry' a play to be given in the town-house at three o'clock. Their repertory includes *The Lascivious Knight*, *Lady Nature*, *Mother Gurton's Needle* (a tragedy), *The Devil and Dives* (a comedy), *A Russet Coat and a Knight's Cap* (an infernal), *A Proud Heart and a Beggar's Purse* (a pastoral), *The Widow's Apron Strings* (a nocturnal).[2] Posthaste is also working on 'the new plot of the *Prodigall Childe*', with a prologue 'for lords' and an epilogue. They are invited to play before Lord Mavortius,

[1] Small, 67, has an excellent analysis of *Histriomastix*. He dates it in 1596, but not convincingly. It might just as well be 1588–90. The text is in R. Simpson, *The School of Shakespeare*, ii. 1, and needs re-editing. Moreover, Simpson thought that Posthaste was Shakespeare. The actor-scenes are i. 112–62; ii. 70–147, 188–344; iii. 179–243, 265–78; iv. 159–201; v. 61–102, 238–43; vi. 187–240. Of these I think that ii. 247–80; iii. 179–217, 265–78 may belong to the Marstonian revision.

[2] Cf. *Hamlet*, II. ii. 415, 'The best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral, scene individable, or poem unlimited'.

and thereupon throw over 'the town play', and attend him, singing:

> Some up and some down, there 's players in the town :
> You wot well who they bee.
> The sum doth arise to three companies :
> One, two, three, foure, make we.
> Besides we that travel, with pumps full of gravell,
> Made all of such running leather,
> That once in a week, new masters we seeke,
> And never can hold together.

The actual performance, perhaps owing to a Marstonian interpolation, consists of a fragment of *The Prodigal Child*, together with a fragment of a piece on *Troilus and Cressida*. At the end Posthaste extemporizes on a 'theame' and the company are rewarded with 3*s*. 4*d*. In Act III a Marstonian passage introduces them to a new poet Chrisoganus, who asks ten pounds a play. But 'our companie 's hard of hearing of that side', and they will be content with their 'goose-quillian Posthast'. Chrisoganus rates their pride and the 'windy froth of bottle-ale' which passes muster for poetry on the stage. The 'proud statute rogues' also refuse an offer from Mavortius of 13*s*. 4*d*. or even £1 6*s*. 8*d*. for another performance, and in view of their 'expense in sumptuous clothes' they must have 'ten pound a play, or no point comedy'. Their insolence is condemned:

> How soone can they remember to forget
> Their undeserved fortunes and esteeme.
> Blush not the peasants at their pedigree,
> Suckt pale with lust ? What bladders swolne with pride,
> To strout in shreds of nitty brogetie !

In Act IV they are rehearsing, and fine Posthaste 1*s*. for coming late. And they quarrel amongst themselves. Clout is discontented with his half-share, and will have 'a whole share, or turn camelion'. Acts V and VI bring Nemesis. As they set up their bills, they are pressed for the wars. There is no remedy. They have alienated the town officers by refusing the town's reward. The 'master-sharers' must even provide their equipment out of their own purses. The soldiers loot their apparel. They will be the sharers now, and the players the hired men. They bid one who 'would rend and tear a cat upon a stage' not to 'march like a drowned rat', but 'look up and play the Tamburlaine'. The hostess claims her shot, 'The sharers dinners sixpence a piece. The hirelings —— pence'; and the hamper has to be searched for a cloak to pawn. The constable demands his dues for

tax-money to relieve the poor, and the excuse that but fifteen pence was shared last week is not accepted in face of the idle and immoral lives that the rascals have led. In the end they are shipped off remorselessly to serve beyond the seas. It will be obvious that, while most of the points of criticism taken by the dramatist are those familiar to the literary pamphleteers, he is also not unsympathetic to the Puritan view of players as a canker in the state.

Jonson wrote his *Poetaster* in the spring of 1601. He had already heard of the intention of the Chamberlain's men against him, which afterwards took shape in Dekker and Marston's *Satiromastix*, and got in the first blows by depicting his assailants as 'a sort of copper-lac't scoundrels' in ancient Rome and their poets as Demetrius 'a dresser of plaies about the town here' and Crispinus 'poetaster and plagiary'. Some of his matter has its reminiscences of *Histriomastix*; some probably rests on details with regard to individual Chamberlain's men which are now irrecoverable.[1] His allusions to their poor winter season of 1600–1 and to the accumulation of shares by leading actors have already been quoted. The chief scene devoted to the players is that in which Histrio is bullied by Tucca, the huffing captain, who calls him 'stalker', 'gulch', 'stiffe toe', 'twopenny teare-mouth', and 'penny-biter', bids him turn fiddler again, get a bass violin at his back and march in a tawny coat with one sleeve to Goose Fair, and accuses his company of being usurers and brokers, who prey upon younger sons and citizens, and furnish facilities at their house for immoral practices. Tucca would bring his 'cockatrice' to see a bawdy play, but the players have nothing but humours, revels, and satires; to which Histrio replies that he is confusing them with 'the other side of Tyber', for 'we haue as much ribaldries in our plaies, as can bee, as you would wish, Captaine: all the sinners, i' the suburbs, come, and applaud our action, daily'. Crispinus is introduced as one who will teach the actors to tear and rant. Tucca bids Histrio give him forty shillings in earnest, since 'if hee pen for thee once, thou shalt not need to trauell, with thy pumps full of grauell, any more, after a blinde iade and a hamper: and stalke vpon boords, and barrell heads, to an old crackt trumpet'. Yet inasmuch as some of the players are 'honest gent'men-like scoundrels, and suspected to ha' some wit', Histrio may make Tucca a supper, and bring Frisker 'my zany' and Mango 'your fat fool', so long as he does not laugh too much or beg rapiers or scarfs;

[1] *Poetaster*, III. iv; IV. iv; V. iii. 108–38.

but by no means 'your eating plaier' Polyphagus, nor 'the villanous-out-of-tune fiddler' Aenobarbus, nor Aesop, 'your politician'. Later in the play Histrio and Aesop inform against Ovid and Horace, who is Jonson, to the government, and although Tucca promises Aesop 'a monopoly of playing, confirm'd to thee and thy couey, vnder the Empirours broad Seale, for this seruice', his actual reward is to be whipped.[1] In the *Apologetical Dialogue* printed with the play Jonson admits his hostility to the players:

> Now for the Players, it is true, I tax'd 'hem,
> And yet, but some; and those so sparingly,
> As all the rest might haue sate still, vnquestion'd,
> Had they but had the wit, or conscience,
> To thinke well of themselues. But, impotent they
> Thought each man's vice belong'd to their whole tribe:
> And much good doo 't 'hem. What th' haue done 'gainst me,
> I am not mou'd with. If it gaue 'hem meat,
> Or got 'hem clothes, 'tis well. That was their end.
> Onely amongst them, I am sorry for
> Some better natures, by the rest so drawne,
> To run in that vile line.

The Return from Parnassus is of less significance, as being a Cambridge, not a London, play, and merely an echo of the main controversy. It was acted during the Christmas of 1601–2, and is a satire of things in general from the university point of view. Amongst other topics the relations of scholarship to the stage are touched upon. Burbadge and Kempe come in, boasting of their victory over Ben Jonson, and trying to recruit poets into their service.[2] The scholars resent such thraldom:

> And must the basest trade yeeld vs reliefe?
> Must we be practis'd to those leaden spouts,
> That nought doe vent but what they do receiue.

And in the end they decide rather to take the road as fiddlers:

> Better it is mongst fidlers to be chiefe,
> Then at a plaiers trencher beg reliefe.
> But ist not strange these mimick apes should prize
> Vnhappy schollers at a hireling rate.
> Vile world, that lifts them vp to hye degree,
> And treades vs downe in groueling misery.
> England affordes those glorious vagabonds,
> That carried earst their fardels on their backes,

[1] Can the Aesop episode be a reminiscence of the part played by Augustine Phillips in the Essex innovation? Cf. vol. ii, p. 205.
[2] *2 Return from Parnassus*, iv. 3; v. 1.

> Coursers to ride on through the gazing streetes,
> Sooping it in their glaring satten sutes,
> And pages to attend their maisterships :
> With mouthing words that better wits haue framed,
> They purchase lands, and now esquiers are namde.

It is the old burden of Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe once more.[1]

The disturbance of theatrical conditions due to the revival of the boy companies became in time less acute. No doubt, the novelty of their performances wore off. Moreover, the companies were not very successful in holding together, partly because of the indiscretions of their managers and the inadequacy of their finance to stand the strain of plague years, but more because the boys, as might perhaps have been expected, grew up and ceased to be boys. Already about 1608 the Blackfriars boys ' were masters themselves ' of their own company, and when this arrangement broke down, they began to be drafted into the adult associations. Other boy companies followed, but these were subject to the same difficulties, and the vogue of the original ' little eyases ' was never quite recaptured.[2] But, after all, the competition had not disappeared, but had merely taken another form. The younger generation was knocking at the gates ; Field and Taylor waiting in eager rivalry for Burbadge's shoes, and meanwhile forming new combinations of their own which, however unstable, at least cut at the profits of their more firmly established rivals. The ' monopoly ' offered by Jonson in jest would no doubt have been welcomed by the principal companies in earnest. The policy of the Privy Council from 1597 to 1600 pointed in this direction, but for whatever reason was not brought into effective operation. There are several indications of the pressure of competition during the earlier part of the seventeenth century. In 1609 it was worth the while of the Queen's Revels and the King's men to unite in buying off the Paul's boys at the cost of £20 a year. Dekker in the same year prophesies that the contention of the two houses of York and Lancaster will be as nothing to that of the three houses, by which he means the Globe, the

[1] In certain other plays which have acters amongst their dramatis personae (e.g. *Midsummer-Night's Dream* and Middleton's *Mayor of Queenborough*) the point is reversed, and it is the regular companies who satirize provincial companies or amateurs.

[2] Thus in 1618 the Mayor of Exeter complained of a company travelling under Daniel's patent for the Children of Bristol (q.v.) that, though the patent was for children, the company consisted of men, with only five youths amongst them.

Fortune, and the Red Bull.[1] Finally, in 1610, the preacher William Crashaw, commenting upon the hostility shown by the players to the plantation of Virginia, declares explicitly that it was motived by the fact that they were so multiplied in England that one could not live by another, and by the refusal of the promoters of the colony to give any of them a chance of trying their fortunes in the new world.[2]

The palmy days of playing lasted beyond the formal limits set to this investigation. But they did not last for ever. The coming of the end can here only be adumbrated. It perhaps shows itself first in an increasing unwillingness amongst the provincial corporations to hear the players. It was in 1623, the year of the publication of the First Folio, that the City of Norwich took the step of making a representation to the Privy Council and obtaining leave not to suffer any players within their liberties. It is true that the inhibition was not strictly carried out and that the authority was renewed in 1640. Nevertheless it is a sign of the times. Other cities, Chester in 1615, Southampton in 1623, Worcester in 1627, closed their public buildings to performances.[3] From this time onwards the entries of payments to players in municipal accounts tend more and more to take the form of 'gratuities' given them 'because they should not play' or 'to dismiss them', or 'to put them off', or in more emphatic terms still 'to rid the town of them'.[4] Meanwhile the Puritan controversy breaks out again, winding up to that alarming compilation of learning and argument in Prynne's *Histriomastix* of 1633, which indeed cost its author his ears, but must none the less have hung like a shadow of fate upon the doomed stage for ever after. And in 1642 the shadow moved, and on the outbreak of war came that dignified ordinance of 2 September, which waved frivolity aside, what time the nation girded itself for matters of moment:[5]

An Order of the Lords and Commons concerning Stage-playes.

Whereas the distressed Estate of Ireland, steeped in her own Blood, and the distracted Estate of England, threatned with a Cloud of Blood, by a Civill Warre, call for all possible meanes to appease and

[1] Cf. ch. xii, introduction. [2] Cf. App. C, No. lviii.

[3] Murray, ii. 235, 400, 410.

[4] Ibid. 199, 231, 264, 312, 341, 384, &c.

[5] The Order was appended to *A Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, For the appeasing and quietting of all unlawfull Tumults and Insurrections in the severall Counties of England, and Dominion of Wales* (1642). The whole pamphlet is facsimiled in J. Knight's edition of J. Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (1886).

avert the Wrath of God appearing in these Judgements; amongst which, Fasting and Prayer having bin often tryed to be very effectuall; have bin lately, and are still enjoyned; and whereas publike Sports doe not well agree with publike Calamities, nor publike Stage-playes with the Seasons of Humiliation, this being an Exercise of sad and pious solemnity, and the other being Spectacles of pleasure, too commonly expressing laciuious Mirth and Levitie: It is therefore thought fit, and Ordeined by the Lords and Commons in this Parliament Assembled, that while these sad Causes and set times of Humiliation doe continue, publike Stage-Playes shall cease, and bee forborne. Instead of which, are recommended to the people of this Land, the profitable and seasonable Considerations of Repentance, Reconciliation, and peace with God, which probably may produce outward peace and prosperity, and bring againe Times of Joy and Gladnesse to these Nations.

Die Veneris Septemb. 2. 1642.

I need not here attempt to trace the faint flutterings of the mimetic instinct which survived this ordinance and even that, final and more detailed, of 9 February 1648, 'for the utter suppression and abolishing of all stage-playes and interludes', whereby players were made amenable to the statutes against vagabonds 'notwithstanding any license whatsoever from the King or any person or persons to that purpose', and the justices were ordered to demolish the houses, and to subject the players, if found, to a whipping.[1] It is sufficient that from 1642 to 1660 there was substantially no public stage in London. Some of the King's men, we are told, went into the army, 'and, like good men and true, served the King their master, though in a different, yet more honourable capacity'. Under the Commonwealth they were 'reduced to a necessitous condition', and we have one glimpse of the last of Shakespeare's fellows, John Lowin, keeping an inn, the Three Pigeons, at Brentford, where he died very old, 'and his poverty was as great as his age'.[2]

[1] Hazlitt, *E. D. S.* 65. [2] Wright, *Historia Histrionica*, 409, 411.

Printed in England at the Oxford University Press